

JPRS 74587

16 November 1979

# East Europe Report

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 1737

Extracts From Enver Hoxha's Reflections On China

Volume 2, Part 1

# NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets ( ) are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as (Text) or (Encrypt) in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or terms preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not found in the original but have been supplied as approximate equivalents. Other untranslatable parenthetical words within the text are given in English with the phrase. Words within parentheses given by name.

The contents of this publication are not to be distributed outside the agency, except as authorized by the agency.

JPRS publications are available to the public at a nominal charge. For information on how to obtain them, contact the JPRS Office, Room 404, 1215 28th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

<b>REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE</b>		1. REPORT NO. JPRS 74587	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.																		
4. Title and Subtitle EAST EUROPE REPORT: POLITICAL SOCIOLOGICAL, AND MILITARY AFFAIRS, No. 1737			5. Report Date 16 November 1979																			
7. Author(s)			8. Performing Organization Rept. No.																			
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Joint Publications Research Service 1000 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22201			10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.																			
			11. Contract(E) or Grant(G) No. (C) (G)																			
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address  As above			13. Type of Report & Period Covered																			
			14.																			
15. Supplementary Notes  EXTRACTS FROM ENVER HOXHA'S ' REFLECTIONS ON CHINA ' Volume II, Part I																						
16. Abstract (Limit: 200 words)  This serial report contains information on official party and government pronouncements and writings on significant domestic political developments; information on general sociological problems and developments in such areas as demography, manpower, public health and welfare, education, and mass organizations; and articles on military and civil defense, organization, theory, budgets, and hardware.																						
17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors  <table border="0"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> International Affairs</td> <td>Propaganda</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Albania</td> <td>Political Science</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Bulgaria</td> <td>Sociology</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Czechoslovakia</td> <td>Military Organizations</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> German Democratic Republic</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Hungary</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Poland</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Romania</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Yugoslavia</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>					<input type="checkbox"/> International Affairs	Propaganda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Albania	Political Science	<input type="checkbox"/> Bulgaria	Sociology	<input type="checkbox"/> Czechoslovakia	Military Organizations	<input type="checkbox"/> German Democratic Republic		<input type="checkbox"/> Hungary		<input type="checkbox"/> Poland		<input type="checkbox"/> Romania		<input type="checkbox"/> Yugoslavia	
<input type="checkbox"/> International Affairs	Propaganda																					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Albania	Political Science																					
<input type="checkbox"/> Bulgaria	Sociology																					
<input type="checkbox"/> Czechoslovakia	Military Organizations																					
<input type="checkbox"/> German Democratic Republic																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Hungary																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Poland																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Romania																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Yugoslavia																						
b. Identifiers/Open Ended Terms																						
c. COSATI Field/Group 5D, 5K, 15																						
18. Availability Statement Unlimited Availability Sold by NTIS Springfield, Virginia 22161		19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 89																			
		20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price																			

16 November 1979

EAST EUROPE REPORT  
POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 1737

EXTRACTS FROM ENVER HOXHA'S ' REFLECTIONS ON CHINA '

Volume II, Part I

AU271527 Tirana ATA in English 27-31, Oct 79; 1-7 Nov 79

[0900 GMT 27 Oct 79 AU]

["'Reflections on China'--Extracts From the Political Diary by Comrade Enver Hoxha Leafing the Pages of the Second Volume"--ATA headline; Part One. See JPRS 73890 of 24 July 1979, No 1701 and JPRS 74000 of 13 Aug 79 No 1707 of the EAST EUROPE REPORT on Extracts from Volume I.]

[Text] Tirana, October 27 (ATA--Following extracts from the second volume "Reflections on China," taken from the Political Diary by Comrade Enver Hoxha.

This volume is the chronological continuation of the first volume "Reflections of China." The notes included in the first volume belong to the period 1962-1972, whereas the notes of the second volume cover the period 1973-1977.

Both volumes were published for the first time and distributed within the party in January 1978, whereas they were made available to the public in June and September 1979, respectively.

In his notes included in the second volume of the book "Reflections on China," Comrade Enver Hoxha devotes a special attention to the further degeneration of the Chinese foreign policy. This volume commences with such a note. In the note, he exposes some anti-Marxist statements by Zhou Enlai concerning the counter-revolutionary stand of China towards the European Common Market, the creation of a "United Europe," as well as the involvement of China in the "third world." As well as this, in this note he also exposes the views of the Chinese leadership with regard to the contradictions. This note has been written at a time when the situation demanded the intensification of the struggle against imperialism and revisionism, the weakening of the

[III - EE - 63]



links of the capitalist chain, the correct utilisation of the inter-imperialist contradictions and the encouragement of the struggle of the peoples against all the capitalist and revisionist oppressors. On the contrary, the Chinese leadership was overtly passing onto the barricade of the enemies of the revolution and was more and more openly coming out with its anti-Marxist theses in its foreign policy. Comrade Enver Hoxha analyses the facts and draws conclusions from them, the correctness of which was confirmed by time.

In the note of Monday, January 15, 1973, entitled:

Some Anti-Marxist Statements by Zhou Enlai

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: In these first two weeks of January, amongst others, a delegation of the Italian Government, headed by the foreign minister, Medici, and a Congolese delegation (from Zaire), headed by the president of that African republic, General Mobutu, have gone to China on official visits.

Zhou Enlai had a meeting with the Italian Medici, at which the two exchanged views. However, nothing was reported in the Chinese press apart from the announcement of a "cordial" meeting, whereas the Italian press, radio and television reported the trip and the Zhou Enlai-Medici talks extensively and especially highlighted this statement of Zhou Enlai's:

China approves the European Common Market, approves and considers correct the creation of a "United Europe," which the states of Western Europe have begun to build.

At the official banquet which Zhou Enlai gave for Mobutu, amongst other things, he stated without reserve: "Despite the form of the regime which is different from that of Zaire, China, of course, like Zaire, is part of the third world...." This is an official statement which has appeared in the Chinese press.

We recall that the Chinese ambassadors in the countries of Europe have expressed such views about the Common Market and "United Europe" to our comrade ambassadors. Hence, in this case we have to do with a political directive issued from the centre, from Peking, with a line and a directive issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese Government. Thus, this line is being applied without hesitation. Not only are we not in agreement with this line and these orientations in any way, but on the contrary we are opposed to them, because they are wrong in principle and practice, because they are not on the Marxist-Leninist line but in opposition to it. These are revisionist-opportunist views and do not assist the revolution, the awakening of the people and their revolutionary struggle against imperialism, capitalism, and the reactionary bourgeoisie.

How Do the Chinese Leaders Justify These Key Political  
Attitudes Stemming From This Line?

Concerning this Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: Only with the "exploitation of contradictions which exist between American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism"? "We must struggle to deepen these contradictions," says Zhou Enlai. So far so good. But in whose favour do we deepen them, and are these the only contradictions? Are there no other contradictions, known or unknown, which we must discover and struggle to deepen in the interest of the economic and political freedom, the sovereignty and self-determination of the peoples, in the interest of the revolution? Should we Marxist-Leninists confine ourselves merely to being interested in deepening the contradictions which exist between imperialist American and the revisionist Soviet Union, and forget the contradictions which exist and must be deepened between the United States of America and its "allies," between the revisionist Soviet Union and its "allies," between these two superpowers and the states of the "third world," which are included in their respective spheres of influence? Should we forget the major class issue, the struggle of the proletariat, that is, the solution of the great contradiction between the proletariat and the capitalist bourgeoisie, between capital and the proletariat, between the proletariat and the people, on the one hand, and the capitalist oligarchy and its state power, on the other hand? Should we forget that the state power of the bourgeois must be destroyed through struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat established in its place, that the bourgeois capitalist order must be replaced by the socialist order?

If we neglect or forget these things, or use formulae as a smokescreen, and in reality act differently, then we do not see, do not judge, and do not carry out things like Marxists.

Let us take the issues one by one. It is true that contradictions exist between the United States of America and the Soviet Union and that we must deepen them. What is the source and basis of these contradictions? They have their source in the very character and the permanent aims of capitalism, in the merciless exploitation of the proletariat and the enslavement of the peoples. Imperialism, the final phase of capitalism, is in the process of decay. It is fighting with guns, causing bloodshed, as well as with policy and ideology, to keep the peoples enslaved, to suppress the revolutions and to attack the rivals which confront it in the international arena. Its decisive enemies, who in the end will wipe it out, are the peoples, the world proletariat, and the revolution. The revolution is marching ahead, socialism is ceaselessly proving its vitality, while American imperialism, the head of a series of capitalist states, and Soviet social-imperialism, the leadership of a series of revisionist states, are in a deep political, ideological, financial and economic, cultural and military crisis.

It is the revolution, which is seething everywhere, as well as the peoples liberation struggles, in all the forms and at all the stages of their

development throughout the world, the strikes, protests, etc., which bring these great death-dealing crises to this decayed, declining world. This is the basis of our struggle against imperialism and social-imperialism, these are the decisive weapons which we must use in order to overcome these enemies. The strategy and tactics of our struggle must be built up in a correct way around this great aim and, in order to deepen the contradictions between the enemies, we must base ourselves on these principles and not on phantasies, adventures or opportunist stands.

The great betrayal by the Soviet revisionists weakened the social camp, but it was unable to halt the advance of the world revolution or to eliminate socialism as a socio-economic order or the Marxist-Leninist ideology, and likewise it was unable to quell the desires and aspirations of the peoples to fight for socialism. Marxism-Leninism is immortal and always triumphant.

But what happened? With the betrayal by the Soviet revisionists, could it be said that all the contradictions of our time in all their complexity were eliminated? Not at all. They were increased both for the United States of America and the Soviet Union, and for their allies, regardless of the treaties, agreements, diplomatic accords, etc., etc. The contradictions the American imperialists and the Soviet revisionists have with each other can never be diminished or die out, on the contrary, they are increasing and extending. At present, despite the contradictions they have, the two superpowers are in alliance to fight the true socialist countries, to fight the Marxist-Leninist communist parties, to fight the peoples aspirations for freedom, self-determination and sovereignty, to combat and suppress peoples just wars. In all these directions they are in agreement. Thus, they are in agreement to fight socialism and communism.

The United States of America is fighting to maintain its hegemony in the world, the Soviet Union is fighting to establish its hegemony. Hence, there is rivalry over the division of spheres of influence and the superpowers try to undermine each others alliances. This is part of the game for spheres of influence and, of course, it has created and will create new contradictions, serious frictions, and possibly even armed frictions. Up till now the atomic bomb has served as a means of intimidation to prevent the outbreak of conflict between the two superpowers.

#### **Zhou Enlai's Opinions About the European Integration Are Anti-Leninist and Reactionary**

The Italian press and radio are writing and speaking enthusiastically about the attitude of the Chinese, who, through the mouth of Zhou Enlai, are calling on Europe "to find its unity in all directions." According to what Zhou Enlai said (again on the basis of the Italian press), "The process of European integration constitutes an essential element in achieving a real easing of tension." According to the same source, Zhou Enlai stressed that "this process must not be restricted to the economic sector, but should affect the fields of policy and defence." It could not be clearer. Since there has been no denial, Zhou Enlai has said these things.



These views of Zhou Enlai's are anti-Leninist and reactionary, contrary to Lenin's well-known theses on the question of the "United States of Europe." Thus, these views of Zhou Enlai's are in line with those of European reaction.

Zhou Enlai is in favour of European integration in the interest of cosmopolitan big capital, that is, for its political, economic and military domination over the peoples of Europe, in favour of the iron law of capital ruling the peoples of Europe. With his theses, Zhou Enlai (who poses as the theoretician of the exploitation of contradictions) completely ignores the major insurmountable contradictions between the proletariat and the peoples of Europe, on the one hand, and the reactionary bourgeois regimes of their countries and the capitalist oligarchies on the other, and likewise he also overlooks the contradictions between these oligarchies themselves. Hence, Zhou Enlai is calling for the class struggle to be extinguished, calling for European integration, calling for the contradictions of European capitalism not to be deepened in favour of the proletariat. Hence, the reactionary press is quite right to exalt Zhou Enlai and has every reason to do so.

The Italian proletariat is on strike almost every day. The Italian bourgeoisie wants to escape this pressure. Italy has been turned into a base of the United States of America against the proletariat, but to no effect. Italian reaction is using the club of the police, but cannot stop the strike wave, the bourgeoisie is fighting for European integration, for the creation of the "United States of Europe," and it is self-evident what the bourgeoisie expects from this and what evils await the workers and peoples of Europe. And here the bourgeoisie is being assisted by Zhou Enlai, who recommended to the peoples and the proletariat of Europe that they should follow the leaders of their countries meekly, instead of saying to them: "Rise against the class enemies, dig the grave for them and push them into it, instead of allowing them to push you in."

However, what impels Zhou Enlai to come out so openly against Marxism-Leninism? He proceeds from another idea and thinks: We must encourage this European reactionary bloc, because it confronts the American bloc, but especially the Soviet bloc. In this way, we deepen the contradictions between the imperialist blocs in favour of socialism. But the question arises: In favour of what socialism are these contradictions allegedly deepened when calls are made to the workers and people not to move, to integrate themselves like a flock of sheep in the pen of the capitalist shepherd? In this case socialism is reduced to China alone, which is inspired by such ideas of Zhou Enlai.

Zhou Enlai should be consistent in his ideas. Since he calls on the European states to integrate themselves under their capitalist oligarchies, then he ought to accept both the Warsaw treaty and the occupation of Czechoslovakia.

Zhou Enlai declares that he is against Soviet hegemony over these states, indeed in this instance, he is in favour of "disintegration." Here he shows



lack of consistency, or he is consistent in it that the satellites of the Soviet Union in Europe should break away and integrate themselves with the other "United" Europe, for the creation of which not only the monopoly bourgeoisie of Europe, but also Zhou Enlai, are appealing.

Zhou Enlai, stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha, is not working to raise the peoples in revolution, to weaken the different links of the capitalist chain, is not helping to burst the weakest links of this cruel chain for the peoples, but without expressing this openly, is preaching the creation of different blocs to bring about a balance of forces in favour of China, but not in the Marxist-Leninist, revolutionary way.

Zhou Enlai and the Chinese leadership say that they are fighting on the two flanks: against American imperialism and against Soviet social-imperialism. However, the struggle on their part against the United States of America has been toned down, and when? Precisely when it is waging its barbarous war against Vietnam and continuing its aggressive struggle elsewhere. At such a time Zhou Enlai pretends that "the revolution is knocking at the door of the United States of America." At these moments of crisis for American imperialism, to give it a hand, as China has done and is doing, not only is wrong, but means to help it. Can it be said that Zhou's theses that "these things are done to deepen the contradictions between the two superpowers in favour of socialism," are confirmed in this way? Does Vietnam or the Middle East gain anything from them? Were the links of the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists weakened because China accepted Nixon's visit? None of these things came to pass. Apparently, the Chinese policy is for the creation of closed blocs, which, of course, will be in rivalry with one another and will be eroded by great contradictions.

A few months ago Chih Peng-fei, the foreign minister of China, made more or less this statement: "China, Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and the other countries of Indochina are one big family...", etc. Here, naturally, the words "bloc," "camp," "socialist countries" did not appear, but there is a flavour of a "yellow family," an "Asiatic grouping," which is not Marxist-Leninist. Hence, today they are calling for "United Europe," for "one big family," and the "third world," and tomorrow may be calling for integration of the countries of Latin America or the "black peoples of Africa." This is the tendency which is apparent in the Chinese policy, and this is not Marxist-Leninist, not revolutionary. It means to divert the peoples attention from the genuine revolutionary struggle.

**Zhou Enlai Included China in the "Third world"  
This Means To Deny Socialism**

Zhou's statement at the banquet with Mobutu is flagrantly anti-Marxist. He included China in the "third world." This means to deny socialism, to conceal the true individuality of China and the character of its socio-economic order from the eyes of the world. This is an opportunist, anti-Marxist view.

To declare that you are in the "third world" means either that you are indulging in demagogy, trying to deceive others, or that in reality, like Titoite Yugoslavia, you are not a socialist country, but completely a bourgeois capitalist country.

Such a declaration tells the world: "Let the revisionists keep the banner of 'socialist countries,' 'the socialist camp,' 'socialist community'--we are of the 'third world'". No, this thesis is anti-Marxist. We Albanians do not agree. Albania is socialist and socialist it will be, even if it must remain alone. We will continue to be a socialist country, and even if we remain like a tiny island on the world map, we will fight with confidence, according to our Marxist-Leninist ideology, with confidence in the revolution, in the world proletariat and the peoples, until socialism and communism triumph throughout the world.

We Marxist-Leninists must distinguish when radical political changes of a truly democratic character are made in a country and when changes which are not of this character are made. We must support the former and not the latter, indeed we must combat the reactionary political changes.

I am becoming more and more convinced that China is not acting in this way. This emerges clearly in the two instances. I mentioned here, but there are many other instances. General Mobutu and his clique are reactionaries, the murderers of Lumumba and other progressive individuals in their country. China receives the representative of this anti-democratic African clique with great honours, and in order to please him, Zhou Enlai declares: "China is part of the third world." In other words, he tells the Congolese people: "I, China, am Mobutu's friend, support Mobutu, because he is a democrat, progressive," etc., regardless that Mobutu suppresses the people and the proletariat, regardless that he declared to Zhou in the middle of the banquet in Peking: "We, Congolese, are what we are, we will remain what we are, and do not want other ideologies," etc., etc. A beautiful outlook for socialism in the Congo if we support Mr. Mobutu.

But the prospects for the revolution and socialism will be equally gloomy if the Marxists and the socialist countries support the "European Common Market," the "United States of Europe," as China is doing, or CEMA and the revisionist grouping of the Soviet Union with its satellites in Europe. No, stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha further on, socialist Albania and the party of labour of Albania will never take this wrong, anti-Leninist road of the Chinese.

It cannot be imagined that the Chinese comrades have fallen into this error unwittingly, without understanding it. For the moment they are waging some sort of "struggle against the Soviet revisionists," regardless of the fact that it is clear that they are not waging it from a genuine Marxist-Leninist platform, but from a chauvinist platform which smacks of a great-power policy, while tomorrow they may cease this struggle, and this must be expected from people who are unclear on the Marxist-Leninist principles, or are clear on them but want to apply their opposite.

A "United States of Europe," Under Capitalism  
Is Either Impossible or Reactionary

The big capitalist powers, whether those of yesterday or those of today, whether imperialist or social-imperialist, have not changed--they have plundered and oppressed and continue to plunder and oppress other peoples and nations. This is what the United States of America is doing, this is what the revisionist Soviet Union is doing, this is what Japan is doing, this is what the French, West-German, British and Italian capitalists have done and are trying to do. In order to do this better, the European capitalists have created the European Common Market and are working for the creation of the "United Europe." In this course, they have the support of socialist China which is opposing the true task of a socialist state and the views of Lenin which have such a contemporary ring when he says.

"From the standpoint of the economic conditions of imperialism--i.e., export of capital and the fact that the world has been divided up among the 'advanced' and 'civilized' colonial powers, a United States of Europe under capitalism is either impossible or reactionary." (V. I. Lenin, "Collected Works," vol 21, p 370 (ALB. Ed).)

This is as clear as the waters of a mountain spring.

With the creation of the "United States of Europe," which Zhou Enlai also supports, the capitalists of Western Europe at present have no other aim except to peacefully share the sweat and blood of the European proletariat and the European peoples. The capitalists want to give this division of the sweat and blood of these peoples a "peaceful" colour, "prettifying" it with such slogans as those about the "technical-scientific revolution," the "consumer society" and other such concoctions. But, as Lenin says, this division cannot be done on any basis other than that of force. Therefore, this bloc of states for the sharing of the plundered spoils is a source of aggressive imperialist wars.

[AU281430 0900 GMT 28 Oct 79 AU]

[ "'Reflections on China'--Extracts From the Political Diary of Comrade Enver Hoxha Leafing the Pages of the Second Volume"--ATA headline; Part Two. See JPRS 73890 of 24 July 1979, No 1701 and JPRS 74000 of 13 Aug 79 No 1707 of the EAST EUROPE REPORT on Extracts From Volume I.]

[Text] Tirana, October 28 ATA--The numerous facts which are mentioned, both in the first and second volumes, show of the policy of rapprochement and strengthening of ties of China with American imperialism. This is testified also by the secret diplomacy the Chinese revisionist leadership had begun to practice at that time, with the USA in particular. The note of Saturday, February 10, 1973 which exposes Kissinger's trip to Peking speaks of this feature of the Chinese foreign policy. The note is entitled: Kissinger in Peking.



This note reads among others: In the history of the kings of France, and precisely in the reign of Louis 13th, the famous Cardinal Armand du Plessis de Richelieu, used his brother in religion, "Le Pere Joseph," to hold secret diplomatic talks with the other states. This is why "Le Pere Joseph" is known to history as the "Eminence Grise" or "The Grey Eminence," the cardinal of darkness. He personifies behind-the-scene intrigues, secret diplomacy.

At present, at the end of the 20th century, Kissinger is playing the same fiendish diplomatic role. He has become the "Eminence Grise" of the American President, Nixon. This German diplomat (regardless of the fact that he is a Jew and fled from Nazi Germany because he was in danger) faithfully serves the most ferocious Hitlerite who has come to power since the Second World War, President Nixon, the chief of American imperialism.

In their practice of contacts and agreements, American imperialism and Soviet revisionism, as two imperialist superpowers, are employing secret diplomacy. This is understandable—it is necessary for them because their policy and actions are contrary to the interests of the peoples of the world, are gangster plots which have to be hatched up in the dark. They do not want their plans and agreements on the division of the world and the exploitation of the peoples to be disclosed, they want to avoid troubles, problems and resistance of the peoples.

Socialist China, too, has begun to practice secret diplomacy deliberately, especially with the Americans, and this is where the danger lies. This practice is not correct and must be condemned. Nobody, whether friend or foe of China, knows or hears what is going on between the United States of America and China. The friends of China, in particular, know nothing. Naturally, this watery soup does not go down with us, and we are fully within our rights to think, and we think correctly and with no mistake, that the Chinese are talking with the agents of American imperialism and taking decisions which they are not telling us or others, because this is not in the interest of the Chinese, since they are not things which can be told because they are unacceptable to the peoples and to be condemned. No other reasons can be found for these actions.

The Chinese leadership may say that if it discloses these negotiations with the Americans, the Soviets will learn about them. Then, why not say openly that you are on the best of terms with the Americans and have such faith in them that you trust them and not us, your friends? Or have your "friends" now become "boring" to you? But if you involve yourself in such secret dealings, this means to join the circles of intrigues and intriguers and to completely change your mentality, judgment and evaluation in regard to other peoples and their problems and troubles.

The Chinese leaders may say: "We are with the peoples, we are not changing our line, and everything we do is in the interests of socialism." It is easy to talk platitudes, but the secret diplomacy continues. The Chinese



attack the Soviets for secretly reaching agreement with the Americans. But what are the Chinese leaders doing? They have started to do the same thing and are continuing at a gallop. They are competing with the Soviets over who will get further into the "bonnes graces" of the fascist Nixon. Kissinger, Nixon's "Ribbentrop," is welcomed in Moscow, Peking and elsewhere like the Messiah of the Jews, in the hope that he will bring them "manna" from heaven to save them, will bring them the blessed world of the "God" of the White House. This is scandalous....

What do the other peoples, who are fighting American imperialism and its lackeys, think and say when they see the Chinese leaders, in particular, doing such things? Do these dirty agreements assist their struggle? What are the Vietnamese, the peoples of Laos, Cambodia, the Arabs and peoples of all continents, the revolutionaries, the genuine Marxist-Leninists, saying? They are saying: Shame...betrayal...revisionist compromise...violation of principles which defend the freedom, independence and sovereignty of the peoples....

However, the secrets will be revealed one day and the stench will rise from "le pot aux roses." The Sino-American alliance is developing. We shall see how far it will go.

In the note of Monday, February 19, 1973 Comrade Enver Hoxha deals with the "cordial and frank" secret talks between Kissinger and Zhou Enlai and Mao. The note is entitled: China has changed course toward the United States of America.

It reads: Everyting is being kept absolutely secret, especially on China's part, and this is scandalous. To talk with the savagest enemy of the peoples, socialism and communism, and to keep these talks and decisions secret is anti-Leninist. To keep those things, which are known to the enemy of the communists and the peoples, secret from the communists, from your friends, from the peoples, means in theory and practice to reach agreement with the enemy and to keep this agreement secret--as it cannot be revealed because it would be condemned by world opinion. Lenin did not permit such ominous hostile stands. He tore the mask from any such activity.

China has changed course toward the United States of America. It describes the Soviet Union as the main enemy, while it is treating America gently. Why? What are its strategic plans and tactics? It is not revealing anything, not saying anything. It has become customary to say that "problems of interest to the two countries were discussed." This is a deception. It is an anti-Leninist stand to talk with the imperialists behind the back of the peoples. How is it possible that these talks are not of interest to the peoples and the revolution? How is it possible that the enemies of the peoples and the revolution should know the details of these talks, and the peoples and the revolutionaries know nothing?

No, Chinese comrades. Here there is only one thing: The secret talks which you are holding "behind closed doors" are to be condemned, and you know this, that is why you are not announcing them. You have reached agreement with the Americans about this, they have imposed their will and tactic on you, you have accepted this, have submitted to them. Hence, you have made concessions in order to gain something which is harmful, ephemeral and very dangerous for China, socialism and peace.

#### Zhou Enlai Is Guiding the Pro-U.S. Course

In the note of Sunday, April 15, 1973, at the time when Mao Zedong rehabilitated Deng Xiaoping, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes among others:

At present, a course pro the United States of America is being followed, and Zhou Enlai is guiding it. China now has two representatives in Washington: One is the ambassador of Zhou Enlai, and the other the envoy of the XINHUA Agency. The United States of America is manoeuvring as it likes. The chairman developed a "great policy," and instead of "deepening the contradictions between the Soviet Union and the United States of America," he linked the two more strongly together, placed himself between two cannons, and now does not know how to get out of this fix. Then it is possible that the fertile mind of the "brilliant" chairman gave birth to an idea: He brought out Deng Xiaoping who was to begin a policy of smiling first to the one side and then to the other. The British advised the "brilliant" chairman that he should adopt their "bascule" policy, or the policy of walking the tight-rope: "Good relations with both, and not good with one and bad with the other, or bad with both." Mao cannot live at all with the number one, he always lives with the number two. Thus one morning we may see a crawling to the Soviets, beginning with small things to achieve the "balance." And no doubt this tactic will be trumpeted as "brilliant."

Then China will come to the standard of its "brilliant policy" of peaceful coexistence, or the third force, which was boosted by Zhou Enlai in an interview or a banquet. "Good relations with the two superpowers, both the United States of America and the Soviet Union," give and take in the two directions, intrigue here intrigue there, allegedly because the contradictions are being exploited, and all this covered with the idea that "I am a great power and nothing can be done in the world without me." "We must continue this way until we become three superpowers with all their features," indeed without any disguise at all, because such work leads to tearing the disguises one after another, as they were torn from the Soviet Union.

#### The People Will Not Forgive China for These Dangerous Stands

This is how the note of Saturday, June 30, 1973 is entitled. In this note Comrade Enver Hoxha swells on the stand of the Chinese leadership towards Nixon-Brezhnev meeting, a pro-American stand, and condemns the very dangerous

course the Chinese revisionist leaders pursue in their foreign policy. In this note Comrade Enver Hoxha writes among others:

Brezhnev went to and returned from the United States of America. His talks with Nixon were very cordial and spectacular. The whole world is cackling about it: The Soviet cowboy even met the "stars of Hollywood," the cowboys of California, embraced and kissed the cowboy actor who plays the role of the "bandit." Very significant....

The clown followed the clown: Khrushchev arranged the "betrothal" and went for the "honeymoon" to the United States, while Brezhnev went there, to Camp David and California, to complete the "marriage" between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, to consummate the "marriage" between him and Nixon. As his dowry Brezhnev took to Nixon the wealth of the Soviet Union, the land, political freedom, sovereignty and prestige of the Soviet Union, in return for a handful of dollars.

#### Why the Chinese Leaders Keep Silent About Brezhnev-Nixon Meeting?

It is a great mistake, stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha, to fail to make an open assessment, publicly in the press, of the agreements reached between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, which are now known worldwide. This is a mistake being made by the Chinese. The Chinese are not maintaining any open official stand over the meeting between Brezhnev and Nixon and what they achieved and agreed upon.

The Chinese silence is not in order but very significant. It shows that China does not want to speak. Why? Because if it speaks it must expose the two "bandits," as the Chinese comrades describe them in the corridors. In order to avoid exposing the one with which it is on its "honeymoon," China does not expose the other.

To say that the Soviet Union and the United States "concluded nothing between them," either means that you fail to see, and this is great political shortsightedness, or means that you understand, remain silent and fail to speak out because you have ulterior aims.

The two big imperialist gangsters reached agreement "urbiet orbi" on important problems between themselves and on international problems. These agreements have been signed and announced openly, but there are also secret agreements which have not been announced, about which nothing is being said, but which can be inferred from what has been written in order to conceal something. The two of them can keep nothing secret, not because they will come out to proclaim these things loudly on the radio and the television, but the world will learn of them when they are put into practice, because those secret decisions have been taken for action at the expense of other peoples.

It is a fact that the United States of America emerged the winner from this encounter. It ensured new major colonial markets there where it could never have dared to hope for this--in the Soviet Union. Exposing the thesis of the Chinese leaders that "The Soviet revisionists are more dangerous than the American imperialists," Comrade Enver Hoxha points out:

Why is it necessary to discuss who is the more dangerous, when the two are equally savage enemies of the peoples, of their freedom, independence, and sovereignty?...to present the problem as these unprincipled and bankrupt politicians do, means to line up on the side of the "weaker," and for them the weaker is the United States of America. It will exploit the Soviet Union, will draw fabulous profits from it, which will serve to strengthen its world empire. Besides this, the introduction of American capital into the Soviet Union will cause even the smallest remnants of the victories of the Great October Socialist Revolution to be eliminated very quickly, will bring about the dismantling of the Soviet Union as a union of republics. This is the objective of American imperialism: to destroy the Soviet Union as a dangerous rival capitalist power.

The "wiseacres" will say: "This will be difficult to achieve." On the contrary, this is easily achieved when you come off the rails of Marxism-Leninism. Revisionism contains within itself the whipping up of nationalist sentiments, and the United States of America will vigorously fan this flame. The "wiseacres" say: "This cannot be achieved." But what do the facts show? Khrushchev came to power, but what did he bring about and what was done in the Soviet Union? Khrushchev fell, the Brezhnev's came to power, but where are things leading to in the Soviet Union? To the sell-out to the United States of America. Tomorrow, those who succeed the present leaders will destroy the Soviet Union even as a state. Whether the revisionists like it or not, that is where their road leads, the aid from and alliance with the United States of America are intended to achieve the objective of "divide and rule," because it is absurd to think that imperialism will assist you to grow strong and dig its grave.

Comrade Enver Hoxha stresses further on that the United States and the Soviet Union made themselves the gendarmes of the world, decided and stated openly that they would intervene anywhere if their interests were threatened, at any time or place that "peace is endangered," according to the terminology which they use. These two superpowers, he continues, want to dominate the world, want to exploit it, want to have it under their feet, under the whip of the lords of the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Therefore they have both defined and undefined. There are written alliances over these things, but there are unwritten alliances, too. In both the written and unwritten alliances the interests of these two overlords will collide, and the point of their secret agreement is that these collisions should not make a big bang, but that the two should reach agreement between themselves and especially to prevent the peoples, at whose expense these deals are being made, from rising in revolt. In this case they have laid down two courses: the first course that the two bandits should agree over the spoils, the



second course, in case the victim rises in revolt, they must smack him and say: "Hush. You are endangering the peace," meaning peace for the bandits, of course.

Here there is no mention of "disarmament," but of the maintenance of armaments, the preservation of the atomic monopoly. There is talk about the efforts to put everybody into the two separate spheres, that is, under the atomic umbrellas of the Soviet Union and the United States of America. China and France, which have the atomic bomb, are considered heretics, therefore the Americans and the Soviets, each have their eye on them to bring them to their knees, "to admit them to the club" in order to wring their necks.

In the light of the Soviet-American alliance, the treaties and agreements of all kinds entered into by the United States of America and the Soviet Union with their respective partners, have taken another significance, another course. Now the two big shots see everything simply from the angle of the alliance which they signed, and their partners in bilateral or multilateral alliance are nothing but pawns in this game of chess.

In this tangle which has been created, although the United States of America and the Soviet Union are the strongest, they feel themselves isolated and completely surrounded by a powerful spirit of anger. They have planned "to clear up" this situation with demagoguery, threats and blackmail. They know that this alliance cannot last long, if each separately and both jointly do not put their own houses and alliances in order, that is, discourage and intimidate the stubborn and favour their obedient partners. Corruption through the ruble and the dollar will be on the order of the day, along with demagoguery, intrigues and arms to keep the cliques in power and to bring in new ones when their power is endangered.

**Very Dangerous, Very Negative and Harmful  
Stands of the Chinese Leaders**

The Soviet Union threatens China, exerts pressure either to achieve rapprochement or to push it towards the United States of America, which is smiling at it, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes further on. And China adopted a strategy which we think is mistaken, to say the least of it: In fact, it abandoned the struggle on two fronts, against the Soviets and the United States of America, and adopted another policy: Hostility with the Soviets and friendship with the Americans.

China is pursuing such a wrong policy because it fears a Soviet attack... will the United States of America defend it? Only a fool or a reactionary could imagine such a thing. What follows? You need aid and credits? So do the Soviets, while being in struggle against them. This is not a policy in the Marxist-Leninist spirit. The Western capitalist states also pursued a policy like this after the Second World War. They relied on the United States of America which financed them and gobbled them up. Fear of the Soviet Union at the time when the great Stalin was alive and running things,

made the capitalist states of the world harness themselves to the American chariot. Now these states and countries are feeling the heavy burden of the chains with which the United States of America has bound them, and want to break them.

China is seeking to try the same experience, and for this there is a very appropriate saying of our people: "I'll sleep with the miller to spite my mother-in-law." Hence China, being afraid of the Soviet revisionists, wants to join the Americans. Should it do such a thing? No, because not only is this not Marxist-Leninist, but it is a fatal mistake.

In our opinion, the position which China has taken, the course which it is following in its foreign policy is neither right nor revolutionary. It is allowing moments very favourable to the revolution to go by, moments of a grave major crisis for American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

The peoples and the Marxist-Leninist will not forgive China for these very dangerous, very negative and harmful stands.

#### **A Nasty Great Mystery Which Lays the Chinese Open To Suspicion and Condemnation**

In the note dated Durres, Sunday, July 29, 1973, Comrade Enver Hoxha condemns the Sino-American deals. He writes:

For us there are many problems in the foreign policy of China which are obscure and which, of course, must be analysed and defined in the report to the congress of their party. But perhaps these problems which are obscure to us, and the wrong stands of the Chinese comrades towards them, may appear to the Chinese comrades to be completely solved, and moreover "solved correctly." In our opinion the Sino-American relations began on a wrong road and continue to develop on a wrong road. What is occurring and what is being done with the Americans? Two whole years have gone by and nothing is being whispered. Kissinger comes and goes mysteriously to China, makes contact with Zhou Enlai, and they hold tete-a-tete talks with each other. Nixon came and went, many delegations of American senators, bankers, scientists, tourists, football players, artists, and spies of every type come and go to China. What do all these do?...what do they say?...what results from all this traffic?...not a word is being whispered...only Zhou Enlai and those close to him know all about this. And Nixon, too, of course. The world knows only that these people go to China, are welcomed with banquets and then leave. A nasty great mystery which lays the Chinese open to suspicion and condemnation. Everyone has the right to ask: "What is being hatched up behind the back of mankind"? When Brezhnev meets Nixon, of course, they take secret decisions, but some of them at least are published. The Chinese publish nothing. What did this mysterious policy bring the Chinese? No good among public opinion, only great harm.

[AU291520 0900 GMT 29 Oct 79 AU]

["'Reflections on China'--Extracts From the Political Diary by Comrade Enver Hoxha Leafing the Pages of the Second Volume"--ATA headlines; Part Three. See JPRS 73890 of 24 July 1979, No 1701 and JPRS 74000 of 13 Aug 79 No 1707 of the EAST EUROPE REPORT on Extracts From Volume 1.]

[Text] Tirana, October 29 ATA--In the note dated Durres, Thursday, August 23, 1973, Comrade Enver Hoxha deals with the incorrect tactics China maintains towards Europe. The note is entitled:

#### China Should not Neglect Europe

In this note Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

We have always been of the opinion, and this we have expressed to Li Xiannian, that China ought to come out in the international arena with an active policy in order to strengthen its revolutionary positions in the world, encourage the world proletariat in the struggle against capital, to assist the progressive peoples who are fighting to win and defend their freedom, independence and sovereignty, and to liberate themselves from the claws of American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. We have told Li Xiannian that a merciless struggle must be waged against these two superpowers, without giving way to principles.

We also hinted to Li Xiannian that China is neglecting Europe and that this is a problem of great importance. By this, we told Li Xiannian, we do not mean our intensive struggle in the four quarters of the world to be forgotten.

Now China, continues Comrade Enver Hoxha, has begun to interest itself in Europe, but not always following correct tactics. There is no need to repeat this matter which I have expressed in my earlier notes.

Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha dwells on Pompidou's visit to Peking. He writes: Why is Pompidou going to Peking?

France sees that the two superpowers are reaching agreement to its detriment in particular, while Bonn is standing between them and gaining ground. Hence, the United States of America, the Federal German Republic and the Soviet Union are becoming a threat to France. France, for its part, wants to break and split this powerful bloc and now has chosen China to rely on. Therefore Pompidou is going to Peking, of course. Pompidou will elaborate on the questions about which France has views in common with China.

China will certainly be in agreement over these matters, but we shall see how it will manoeuvre to make the most gains, because it sees things "with only one eye," it sees the Soviet Union with powerful binoculars and the

United States of America and Bonn with weak ones. But in all this it must not forget the proletariat, the revolution and the peoples of Europe who are fighting against capital.

### China Is Getting Caught Up in the Political Game of the Two Superpowers

Through convincing arguments Comrade Enver Hoxha exposes in the note of Saturday, June 21, 1974, the strategic aims of China, which supports the European Common Market and "United Europe" leaving the road of the revolution into oblivion.

### China Supports European Capitalism

China, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, is showing itself in favour of and supports the European Common Market and "United Europe."

What is China's strategic aim and is it based on Marxist-Leninist principles? In order to determine this, we must define the aims of these organisms which China defends or supports.

Explaining this aim Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

When it was created, the European Common Market had as its aim the development of economic and commercial relations between its members, which were six at first, and then became nine. The aim of this institution was to enable the capitalist bourgeoisie of each member country to make the maximum profit, as well as to strengthen the capitalist economy of each separate state and all of them in general.

With the creation of the European Common Market, on the one hand, the efforts of American imperialism to dictate its economic and political policy to this institution continued, and on the other hand, the efforts of the members of the European Common Market to liberate themselves from American tutelage also continued. In this way, contradictions, which grew steadily deeper, arose between them.

The so-called cold war concealed these contradictions to some extent, because even though the members of the European Common Market began seriously to display their economic independence, from the angle of defence, they were obliged to live under the American atomic umbrella. Naturally, the United States of America knew how to exploit the feeling of fear of a war with the Soviets, which emerged in the countries of the European Common Market, to its own advantage.

The Khrushchevites betrayal freed the capitalist bourgeoisie from their fear of the revolution and communism, assisted world capital and gave it the possibility to draw breath. The Khrushchevite betrayal split the revolutionary forces of the whole world, put off the proletarian revolution, fostered



nationalist manifestations and gave the capitalist bourgeoisie time and the possibility to strengthen its weak internal position at the expense of the proletarian revolution and to undertake other activities and enter new combinations among states in the international arena. Filled with nationalist sentiments, the Khrushchevite social-imperialists aspired to turn the Soviet Union from a socialist state into a imperialist atomic superpower, and they achieved this aim. Thus two superpowers competing for world hegemony were created. The law of both of them--the United States of America and the Soviet Union--is the law of the fight for plunder, the law of the enslavement of the peoples. This law is associated with the achievement of monstrous "alliances," with the capture, through disguised force, of strategic points to be used for the preparation of war, with their arming to the teeth, and the build-up of ever more modern atomic weapons, is accompanied with the plunder and the economic and political gobbling up of many states by means of intimidation, blackmail, credits and aid," and subversion.

In these ever changing situations, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, Western Europe took more courage. France under De Gaulle developed a policy more independent from the Americans and the Anglo-Saxons in general. De Gaulle left NATO, respecting only the treaty. Of course, De Gaulle, too, dreamed of a European Common Market and a "United Europe" in which, without neglecting Adenauer's Germany, France would dominate. Of course, De Gaulle's aims could not be achieved, because his partners had their own aims, ambitions, and fears.

All these imperialist powers, whether the two superpowers, "United Europe, or Japan, aspire to hegemony. Since the time that the grave crisis of the dollars began, and the American military defeats in Southeast Asia--in Vietnam, Cambodia and elsewhere--"United Europe" has begun to restrengthen its internal political positions and to aspire more strongly, as a self-contained organism. To turn into a new capitalist and imperialist superpower, this, then, is the "United Europe" which the China of Mao Zedong encourages and assists.

Hence, to support a course of European capitalism which aspires to hegemony, aspires to become a superpower, as China is doing, is wrong in principle, stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha, to act in this way means to leave the road of the revolution in oblivion and to become caught up in the political game of the two superpowers, struggling and manoeuvring from the standpoints of their policies, while overestimating the manoeuvres of the superpowers in the changing situations of the contradictions which they have, underestimating the world proletarian revolution, and underestimating the struggle of the peoples against the superpowers and the capitalist bourgeois states. China is wrong when it preaches that "the main enemy is the Soviet Union, while the United States of America is less dangerous." It is true that the United States of America has suffered defeats, but it remains an imperialist power. To weaken the struggle against it means to weaken the revolution and assist American imperialism. The Chinese will be making the same mistake, if the United States of America starts "to show its wolf's teeth," then China will begin to say that the "Soviet Union is less dangerous, whereas the United States of America has become more dangerous." China is wrong when it puts

itself in the position of Don Quixote towards the old capitalist Europe, allegedly because it will become a counter-weight to the Soviets, on the one hand, and the Americans, on the other, while "China will benefit," since it supports "United Europe."

The contradictions between imperialists must be deepened and exploited in our favour, but only from the class positions, from the positions of the proletarian revolution. China is not doing this, but doing the opposite by telling the peoples of Europe, America and the "third world": "Support your capitalist and imperialist bourgeoisies, because the main enemy is Soviet social-imperialism." This road is not Leninist, does not encourage the revolution, but defends that opportunism which the Second International defended and Lenin exposed. Hence, we cannot agree with this strategy and tactic of China. For us, the main struggle against the imperialist super-powers and world capitalism is the people's struggle, the proletarian's struggle, the world proletarian revolution.

Mao's mistaken foreign policy, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha further on, gives the impression that it is simplistic. In this policy the Chinese not only do not proceed from proletarian class positions, but without saying so, indeed while denying this in words, they are proceeding on the road of a great power.

At present, China is trying to convince the capitalist countries that "the threat to them comes from the Soviet Union." As if China were teaching the capitalists of the world something new. But the capitalists consider communism and the revolution their main enemies.

The aim of the policy of both the Chinese and the Americans is to combat the Soviet Union, but while the Chinese want to set the Americans fighting the Soviet Union, the United States of America and its allies want to set China fighting the Soviet Union. Both sides are developing this "chasse croise" (reciprocal change of places between two parties (French in original)) from the same position and with the same hopes. However, the Soviet Union is not sitting idle.

World capitalism, and European capitalism in particular, has gone through a series of world wars, which have had their source in the savage nature of capitalism. Thus, the "United Europe," the France of Giscard d'Estaing, or the Germany of Strauss, are not easily hoodwinked by the policy of Zhou Enlai and Deng Xiaoping. They will not go to war with the Soviets on Deng Xiaoping's urging.

The European bourgeoisie, continues Comrade Enver Hoxha, is an old whore that has committed all the sins. It is experienced in trickery and intrigues. Only the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the peoples gives it its deserts. In the fight on this terrain it is exposed and smashed, and its intrigue and trickery loses its force. This is the terrain from which China should fight, proceeding from the principle that diplomatic recognition

and trade with the capitalist countries of Europe should serve a sound revolutionary strategy, and it should not try to incite Western Europe to fight the Soviets. In the past, Britain and France used this wrong course of China's to incite Hitler against the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union against Germany. We know the outcome of those manoeuvres. Stalin did not fall into those errors, did not fall into the positions of the Anglo-Americans, or those of the Hitlerites.

The revolution, stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha concluding this note, must be made by fighting both the United States of America and the Soviet Union.

#### China Has Joined in the Political Dance of the Bourgeoisie

In the note of Friday, July 4, 1975, analysing the foreign policy of China, Comrade Enver Hoxha argues that this policy of the Chinese leadership is not based on the Marxist-Leninist theory, but is a pragmatic policy.

In foreign policy, too, the China of Mao Zedong poses as a socialist country which is following a socialist policy. In reality, this is not so. Its policy is not a Marxist-Leninist one.

Since China announced itself as a state which is part of the "third world," in principle it follows the policy of this "third world," which has nothing socialist about it. It is self-evident that in the "third world," China confounds its policy with the bourgeois, capitalist, revisionist policy of this third world.

The policy of Liu Shaoqi, Zhou Enlai and Deng Xiaoping before the Cultural Revolution was: "Alliance with all the states of the world, including the Soviet revisionists." At present the policy of Zhou Enlai and Deng Xiaoping is: "Alliance with all the countries of the world, including American imperialism against the Soviets" but which line is Mao Zedong with? It is implied that he approves and later disapproves these lines, but in fact he is with them and is contributing to this course which China is following.

China is pursuing a see-saw policy. It has opened up its policy, has diplomatic links with all, wants to affirm itself in the world. We, too, have wanted and suggested this to it, but how should China affirm itself in the world? As a socialist country or as a country of the "third world"? Of course, China should affirm itself as a socialist country. However, it is not doing this. It is affirming itself in the world as a state opposed to the Soviet Union. For China the Spain of Franco, the Chile of Pinochet, or the Rhodesia of Ian Smith are friends, while the "Soviets are the most dangerous, because they pose as Marxist-Leninists." This is not a principled stand. The struggle of China against the Soviets is not being waged on the ideological platform to unmask their social-imperialist policy on this basis. No, China is not doing this properly at all. Why is it not doing this? Because its policy is not based on the Marxist-Leninist theory. China has

joined in the political dance of the bourgeoisie, adopted a pragmatic policy and is convinced that this policy is the most correct. China forgets that the policy which it is pursuing indiscriminately with presidents and kings, with princes and princesses, with fascists and Bonn revanchists, with American imperialists, or with others like Pinochet, is not some original policy. The capitalist bourgeoisie has practised such a policy extensively, and so have the hereditary monarchies and the aristocracy earlier. China seeks the friendship of ruling cliques in order "to approach the peoples," instead of winning the hearts of the peoples by convincing them that it fully supports their cause.

What aid does China give the peoples and the revolutionaries of Chile or the Philippines, or the German revolutionaries, when it scandalously proclaims itself to be with Pinochet, with Marcos, with Strauss, and others like them? It gives them no aid at all, it only discourages them. With the policy it is pursuing, China is encouraging the blackest reaction. China leaves the revolutionaries to suppose that this is a "political manoeuvre." In fact, this is a counter-revolutionary manoeuvre, because if the revolutionaries follow the policy of China, they must not fight against reaction. However, revolutionaries cannot be two-faced, cannot fight against reaction and be with reaction at the same time.

#### The Chinese Policy Is not Based on a Proletarian Class Line

Under this title appears the note of Thursday, July 31, 1975 in which Comrade Enver Hoxha speaks of the further degeneration of the Chinese foreign policy into a counter-revolutionary policy which assists American imperialism and the capitalist powers of the world.

We must not forget, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, that the Soviet Union, as a social-imperialist state, sees a great danger in Mao's China, and is therefore striving to erode it and possibly even to attack it. But, as the social-imperialist state it is, it thinks that China, too, might attack the Soviet Union. I think that China will not come to this, but strategically is aiming to gain the time it has lost in order to become a great power economically and militarily, with a very modern agriculture and industry. If China achieves this objective undisturbed by wars, it will become a colossal power, a third great world power. But what sort of great world power? Socialist or imperialist? China, too, continued Comrade Enver Hoxha, will become a social-imperialist power.

What are China's positions in the international arena at present? In my opinion it is not maintaining a revolutionary stand, not pursuing a policy seen as it should be, from the class angle of the revolution.

The distinguishing feature of the current international policy of China is its call for the "unity of all": American imperialism, other big capitalist



powers, the "third world," in which it publicly includes itself, "the non-aligned world," and finally the peoples, the Marxist-Leninists and all the revolutionaries. Hence, it calls on all these, without distinction, for "unity" against the social-imperialist Soviet Union. This openly non-Marxist policy of China says to all: "Put the class struggle to one side, forget the revolution for a time (until, I, China, become a great power), proletarians of the whole world, unite your efforts with the bourgeoisie that oppresses you because (listen to me and follow me) we must first of all defeat the number one enemy, the social-imperialist Soviet Union, and then we shall see what we shall do."

This sort of policy of China, which assists American imperialism and the world capitalist powers, is confusing and splitting the revolutionary forces and the communists throughout the world. This is what the Khrushchevites did, too. What did they say? "Peaceful coexistence, friendship with all, especially with the Americans, struggle against Marxist-Leninists, against revolutionary wars, revolution in a peaceful way," etc., etc. What is China saying now? All these things we mentioned and which are now well-known, but meant for and aimed against the Soviet Union. China also speaks "against" the United States of America in undertones, while in his time Khrushchev spoke "with big bombs." The contradictions of China with the United States of America are, you might say, dormant.

With astonishing naivety China thinks that the United States of America and the other countries to which it is appealing for unity, "will march" against the Soviet Union, as it wants and when it wants. There is a great gulf fixed between its desire and the reality--in life the opposite is occurring. American imperialism and its allies accept and support the policy and call of China, because it means colossal gains for them. They are greatly assisted by this policy in their activity for the confusion and suppression of the revolutionaries, for the tonning down of the class struggle, and the incitement of all forces against the Soviet Union and other revisionist parties in whatever country they are operating. In their global strategy, the American imperialists and their allies are inciting China against the Soviet Union as much as they can, while doing everything in their power to frighten it with the Chinese danger, in order to more easily achieve their own aims, to weaken and undermine the Soviet Union even more thoroughly and as quickly as possible, and then to turn on China with multiplied forces. This is clear to anyone with a few brains, but not to the Chinese. The Chinese leaders boast that they are weakening the Soviet Union and deepening the contradictions between it and the United States of America with their policy. But they forget that there is also another possibility on which they are not reflecting at all, that this policy is in favour of the United States of America.

Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

China is establishing diplomatic relations with many states of the world, even with fascist states. It is carrying on extensive international trade, may even provide credits, but it can be seen clearly everywhere that it devotes great importance to and strives to point out its links with the heads of the regimes of these countries, in particular.

The people, underlines Comrade Enver Hoxha, are the only real basis of the struggle against the Soviet social-imperialists, the American imperialists and the local bourgeoisie. This factor must never be forgotten on any occasion. However, the Chinese have forgotten it. Their alliances and hopes are based on the bourgeois and capitalist chiefs. The Chinese think that these are "loyal allies" of the revolution, provided they show even the slightest sign of anti-Sovietism. The fascist regime of Chile is thoroughly anti-Soviet and pro-American, and for the Chinese it is an ally and a fellow-traveller.

Openly and forcefully, we affirm our stands and policy on everything, about every event, about every political combination to the detriment of the peoples. For all these reasons we see that our policy differs from that of China on many matters of principle. We think that this is good, because the peoples and the Marxist-Leninists are able to judge for themselves who is thinking and acting correctly and who wrongly, and then it is up to them to follow the Marxist-Leninist road and to adapt this to the concrete situations in their countries.

Many times our party has wanted to have comradely discussions with the Chinese comrades about these vital matters of principle and still wants to do so, but the Chinese do not want these discussions and avoid them.

Such a mistaken policy of China in the international arena results from non-Marxist-Leninist views affirmed in China. It is difficult to define precisely what is going on in that country, but one thing we can say: There cannot be stability there, there must be powerful rival groups there, which, under the banner of Mao, are each seeking to gain dominant positions in the party and the state.

[AUJ01630 0900 GMT 30 Oct 79 AU]

["'Reflections on China'--Extracts From the Political Diary by Comrade Enver Hoxha Leafing the Pages of the Second Volume"--ATA headline; Part Four. See JPRS 73890 of 24 July 1979, No 1791 and JPRS 74000 of 13 Aug 79 No 1707 of the EAST EUROPE REPORT on Extracts From Volume I.]

[Text] Tirana, October 30 ATA--On Thursday, October 2, 1975 Comrade Enver Hoxha analyses in his note the basic criteria from which non-proletarian foreign policy of China is guided. The note of this day is entitled:

#### **The Foreign Policy of China Is Not Revolutionary**

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: In its international policy the Communist Party of China is maintaining wrong, non-Marxist stands. Its policy is not a revolutionary, proletarian class policy, is not pro the revolution. Up till yesterday the Peoples Republic of China and its foreign policy were

shut in their own shell, but now they have opened up indiscriminately and in our opinion the opening has taken a wrong direction.

What is their wrong direction?

The Communist Party of China poses as though it is assisting the world revolution and the Marxist-Leninist communist and workers parties, but in reality is not doing this.

The Communist Party of China claims that "China is part of the third world," instead of affirming itself as a socialist country and assisting the peoples of the world and not the cliques ruling them, especially the blood-thirsty cliques of the reactionary bourgeoisie, who sell themselves to any imperialist in order to maintain their domination over their own peoples. China propagates friendship and alliance with the whole of the "third world" without any political distinction, and especially without making any class distinction, without struggling or doing anything to deepen the contradictions between the working class of these countries and their oppressors, the reactionary bourgeoisie. The Communist Party of China and the policy of the Chinese state are ignoring these contradictions and acting to soften them by openly defending cliques such as those of Pinochet, Franco, Mobutu, and many others. This is not a Marxist-Leninist policy, but an anti-Marxist one, because it is an attempt to quell the class struggle at the international level. Hence, the Communist Party of China and the Chinese state forget their class ally, the world proletariat, underestimate it and highlight their alliance with the heads of the bourgeoisie who are ruling over the proletariat and the peoples. And this kind of alliance, not seen from the class angle, is switched according to circumstances.

The Chinese foreign policy is guided by two basic criteria:

The first criterion: Are you well-disposed towards China, or not? If you are, or pose as if you are, whoever you may be, you are the ally and friend of China, and "I, China, forget the class aspect of policy and defend you, welcome you with cymbals and even give you credits, if you sing my praises, I love you greatly whoever you may be, if you love me to some extent, I regulate my friendship within these bounds, if I should hear that you oppose me or switch your affections, then I turn the weather-cock right around to the beginning of hostility." Hence, unstable friendship, friendship of a bourgeois character.

The second criterion: If you are against the Soviet revisionists, you are a friend of China, whoever you may be. The principle which the Chinese policy pursues is: The main enemy of China and the whole world is Soviet social-imperialism, because it "is unexposed, war-like and seeking world hegemony." Therefore, according to the Chinese policy, a "holy alliance" against the Soviet Union must be created with the United States of America, about which the Chinese say, "It is imperialist," but a second-rate "enemy,"

after the Soviet Union. This is said for the sake of appearance, but the Chinese aim to establish a social-democratic alliance with the United States of America.

China is assisting the United States of America and the Western capitalist states to get over the crisis painlessly, it is assisting them politically and ideologically. It has opened up the market of its own country to them and permits investments of foreign capital in China. All this is being done under the disguise of a "Marxist-Leninist" policy and allegedly in order to fight the number one enemy, the Soviet Union, which tomorrow may quite possibly become its number one friend.

#### China and Yugoslavia

Exposing the unprincipled stand of the Chinese leadership words Tito and Titoism, Comrade Enver Hoxha stresses in the note of Tuesday, October 7, 1975:

The leaderships of these two states have fallen in "love" old acquaintance and sympathy. The Chinese and Mao himself were very pleased with the struggle which Tito waged against Stalin, cheered him in this struggle and described it as right. From Mao's own mouth came the words: "Tito was not wrong, but Stalin was wrong."

If we see pronounced zigzags in the Chinese line on the political and ideological definition of the revisionist activity of Tito and Titoism, stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha, this stems from the opportunist policy of the Chinese.

As we know, the policy of Tito, in essence, is anti-Soviet and pro-American, but Tito feints and dodges, he always has done this, and has shown himself to be an adventurer and an acrobat.

There is no doubt, underlines Comrade Enver Hoxha, that the Soviets want to have Yugoslavia under their yoke, and for this they employ every means, every policy, every conspiracy, every manoeuvre, they flatter Tito, write and speak well about him, promise him and give him credits. The old fox Tito is making approaches to and smiling at them. When they are unable to achieve their full aims, the Soviets snarl. Then Tito assumes the pose of the cat which sharpens its claws and raises its whiskers against the Soviets, while meowing for help in the direction of the Americans.

Such is the Titoite policy which greatly pleases the Chinese. Why? First, because they are of one mind with Tito, and second, because in essence he is pro-American and anti-Soviet, and third, because the Chinese have to increase their friendship with Tito in order to "deepen the contradictions between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. Brilliant tactics.

Yesterday, Dzemal Bijedic, the Yugoslav prime minister, arrived in Peking where he received a "warms and affectionate" welcome, with crowds, with cymbals, with slogans and banners.



While they postpone the date of the visit of our delegation for more than two years, the Chinese welcome the Yugoslav prime minister, Bijedic. With this stand they want to tell us: "We do not want to accept you, because we have political and ideological contradictions with you, while with the Yugoslavs we Chinese have no contradictions (and the facts show this with the visit of Bijedic)."

### China Is Inciting the World War

In the note of Thursday, December 3, 1975, Comrade Enver Hoxha exposes the short-sighted policy of the Chinese leadership towards American imperialism and the efforts it is making to incite the world war which allegedly will break out in Europe.

Gerald Ford in Peking, Mao Zedong received him and talked with him for two hours.

Deng Xiaoping and his suite welcomed the American President at the airport. The talks were held with Deng. He put on the banquet and delivered the speech. Ford delivered a speech in reply.

At the time when Liu Shaoqi was in power, and Deng at that time was general secretary of the party, the famous slogan was launched: "Alliance with all, even with the Soviet revisionists, against American imperialism." We did not accept this front against American imperialism with the Soviet revisionists as allies, for reasons which are known. This Chinese slogan and the Chinese policy based on it did not last long but fizzled out.

Now the other slogan has emerged, also from Deng, but naturally with the approval of Mao and Zhou Enlai: "A front with all, including American imperialism, against Soviet social-imperialism." Again we are in opposition to this Chinese slogan and policy. These two lines, both the former and the latter, are anti-Marxist. The former lines us up with and reconciles us to the Soviet revisionists and to other sworn enemies of Marxism-Leninism, socialism and the revolution. Our views, that American imperialism and the revisionist Soviet Union were and still are sworn enemies of socialism and the peoples, turned out correct. Life showed that those with whom the Chinese called on us to join in an anti-imperialist front, proved to be social-imperialists. Hence, our line was Marxist-Leninist, while the Chinese line was wrong, liberal and pro-revisionist.

The new Chinese line, the present one, is again liberal, opportunist, and anti-Marxist, while our line, which opposes it, is correct.

China, in fact, is inciting the world war, which allegedly will break out in Europe, instead of fighting against predatory war and encouraging just revolutionary wars. China does not even raise the great objective that, if the imperialist war cannot be prevented, it must be turned into a revolutionary war against the warmongers.

Deng and Mao brought out the theory of the "third world" and said that this world is "the ally of China." Deng "frightens" Ford with this theory, posing as if he has this "third world" in his pocket. But Ford laughs, because it is he who has the ruling cliques of this "world" in his pocket, and not Deng.

China's game is dangerous and immature. China is in danger from the Soviet Union, but at present it is hiding this danger, posing as strong, to "convince" the United States of America. Hence, China is trying to say that the Soviets are unable to attack it, but since they are social-imperialists, they will attack someone. Therefore, China has made its "Marxist" analysis according to which "the Soviet Union is going to attack Europe. Hence, you in Western Europe beware, because war is knocking at your door. Listen to me, China, you peoples of Europe, you must arm yourselves, unite with your reactionary bourgeois governments who oppress you and hurl yourselves on the Soviet Union. Don't reduce the tension, but raise it. I am with you. And you America, too, must watch out, get out of the crisis, unite more strongly with Western Europe, and all world reaction, and don't reduce but raise the tension with the Soviet Union, if possible, attack it and pull the chestnuts out of the fire for me."

In his speech Ford set out what the interests of the United States of America are. It is evident that its interests are: to continue to dominate the world, hence, it is for hegemony, to weaken the Soviet Union, and also to have China under its control, possibly even to drive it into war with the Soviet Union, so that it is China which pulls the chestnuts out of the fire for the United States of America.

Many times history has been bargaining between rogues: each trying to outwit the other. But is it so easy to deceive American, French, West German, or British imperialism? One would have to be naive to believe such a thing.

#### The Zig-zags of the Chinese Line

In the note of the Thursday, January 1, 1976, analysing the events, Comrade Enver Hoxha draws the conclusion that the Chinese leadership pursues a hostile, bourgeois, anti-Marxist and anti-revolutionary policy of a big power rendering a great service to the capitalist world. He writes among others:

At other times I have written what I think about the line of the Communist Party of China, and in connection with this, I have expressed opinions on many questions and problems of its national and international policy and judged these events (of course, as far as I have been able) from the angle of our Marxist-Leninist theory. I have given my ideas on all main events observed in China and on the political-ideological course which they took.

In its foreign policy, China is not guided in anything by Marxism-Leninism, the revolution and the class standpoint. All the basic Marxist-Leninist principles have been abandoned in China. It is not waging a class struggle

against the two superpowers, its non-Marxist policy has eliminated the Marxist ideology in its foreign policy.

China is distorting the Marxist-Leninist theory which teaches us that the proletariat stands at the head of the peoples on the one side of the barricade, and on the other side are imperialism and world capitalism, to which Soviet social-imperialism has been added.

Mao's theory that "the countryside must encircle the city" continues to predominate in the foreign policy of China, and this is expressed in the "theory" that the "third world (in which China is included) must encircle and liquidate the second and first world." But Mao's China is effectively supporting these two "worlds," which it pretends it must encircle and right, in their oppression of their own peoples and the peoples of the "third world," which it allegedly considers the soldiers of the revolution. China defends Franco, Pinochet, NATO, the European Common Market and "United Europe," reactionaries like the German Strauss, the Englishman Heath, the Italian Fanfani, and others. This cannot be called a Marxist-Leninist class policy. The famous "third world" cannot be accepted en bloc as the Chinese do. A genuine socialist country absolutely must make some differentiation in its alliances with different states and in giving state aid. Its relations with a state of the "third world," not to mention relations with Franco and Pinochet, must first be looked at from the class viewpoint in order to avoid hindering the revolutionary and progressive forces who are fighting in this or that country, on the contrary its relations must ensure that these forces are assisted. With Mao's theory, however, China neglects this, indeed it makes it quite plain that it does not want to fall out with the bourgeois, capitalist and despotic leaders of these countries who are against their own peoples, who are with those great powers who give them the most support and credits.

A wrong policy on the part of China is apparent, also, in connection with the Marxist-Leninist communist parties which have been formed in the world. Besides these parties, Trotskyite and anarchist groups of every kind, from the groups which acted under the guidance of Sartre to those of any bourgeois and provocateur faction have popped up like mushrooms, and China maintains contact with them all without any distinction. It welcomes and farewells their representatives, to whom it preaches unity with the social-democrats, propaganda about China and Mao and alliance with the local bourgeoisie and the United States of America against the Soviet Union.

This is a hostile anti-Marxist, anti-revolutionary bourgeois great-state policy. But such dangerous adventures cannot go down with our party.

At a superficial glance, these ideas about China's stand and our view that China must be considered a revisionist country may seem surprising, continues Comrade Enver Hoxha. Such an opinion may appear to be wrong and unrealistic, but there is no other way to explain these stands on a series of issue of internal and foreign policy. China is ready to agree to talks,

indeed to reconciliation, on many questions with the revisionist countries and the revisionist parties which only yesterday supported the Soviet Union and which criticize it today. What I am saying is not a supposition but the reality. The Chinese welcomed the Spaniard Carrillo to Peking, talked with him and parted with him as friends. Why not? Why was no communique to prove the opposite published? Diplomatic relations were established with Franco's Spain, while the Communist Party of Spain (Marxist-Leninist) the members of which are being killed by the Falangists, is entirely disregarded by the Chinese. Why? Because the Marxist-Leninist Communists of Spain do not think like Jurquet of France, who is a devotee of Mao Zedong Thought and tells the adherents he has to support the army of the French bourgeoisie.

China speaks well of any revisionist country provided only its seeks rapprochement with American imperialism.

Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha continues:

China supports Yugoslavia politically, because for the moment it cannot support it ideologically for the reason that it stinks, reeks of betrayal. But Titoism is nothing but living capitalism, and Titoite Yugoslavia a state which is guided by the anarchist idea of federalist "self-administration," where the state is maintained for the needs of the moment and where Titoism liquidated the party of the communist. It liquidated the party and allegedly left the class "to administer itself," but in fact, in this way it favoured the wealthy bourgeoisie, new and old, to become the owner of Yugoslavia, to enrich itself and sell the country to foreigners. In reality, chaos and anarchy reign in the economy, politics and ideology in Yugoslavia. The bourgeois and revisionist world calls Yugoslavia "socialist," while it calls Tito a "greatman," because he stood up to Stalin, but in so doing he performed and is continuing to perform great services for American imperialism and big world capital. With its political and ideological stands China is great harm to socialism and the revolution and the peoples liberation struggle on a world scale.

The capitalist world recognizes this service on the part of China.

The distinguishing characteristic of modern revisionism is "peaceful co-existence," seen and implemented from an angle which is not a class revolutionary angle. Another of its characteristics is the peaceful, parliamentary road of taking power in order "to go over to socialism." Such is also the line which Khrushchev advocated and the Soviet revisionists preach today, and such is the line of the Italian, French, Spanish and other revisionists. This is also the line, the road of the Chinese. They, too, are advocating this road. Since they preach alliance and collaboration with all the bourgeois, capitalist states and all their institutions, including their bourgeois parliaments, they have abandoned the revolution. This is the reality. In theory and practice, irrespective that theoretically the Chinese do not admit this. Neither do the Soviets admit their crimes: They call Khrushchevite peaceful coexistence "Leninist" and they never forget to accompany



the parliamentary road of taking power with Lenin's statement that, "It is possible that power can be taken on this road, too." But the revisionists have made this the only road and de facto, combat the other road, the road with arms, with violence, the road of revolution and the establishment of genuine socialism.

These fundamental theoretical problems must be gone into thoroughly and not superficially. One must not trust words but facts, and these facts must be analysed from the angle of our Marxist-Leninist theory. How can one understand the gesture of the Chinese in the last day of the last year when they freed the Soviet helicopter with its crew of three, whom they had held prisoner for 21 months on end "because they had entered 400 kilometers into Chinese territory"? They did well to release them, because there were two things which should have been done: either to put the Soviet airman on trial or to release them after a couple of months. But what occurred? For 21 months the Chinese press left nothing unsaid about this helicopter: "This is a criminal act, and act of espionage, a brutal provocation," etc. from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Peoples Republic of China. They had told Behar Shtylla officially, "The Soviet airmen are spies, the helicopter was full of espionage apparatuses, we have captured important documents," "the helicopter had landed in Xinjiang to kidnap people, etc. Meanwhile the Soviets maintained that the helicopter had lost its bearings. However, after 21 months the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Peoples Republic of China made a different statement, saying that the helicopter had lost its way, that the airmen were innocent, therefore they were being freed, and an official dinner was put on for them by the foreign ministry, and they were farewelled "solemnly" at the airfield.

What can you call this stand? What name can you give it? this does not make sense except as part of something going on behind the scenes. There is something behind all this, something that stinks. It will not surprise us if such a switch a la Chinese is called "a majestic political gesture of Mao Zedong," and of course, a "Marxist-Leninist" switch. Perhaps after this "brilliant switch," Zhou Enlai or Deng Xiaoping will tell our ambassador in Peking, "Come on, let's go to Moscow, what are you waiting for, the situation has changed," because this is precisely what Zhou Enlai told our ambassador when Khrushchev fell. Someone starts a rumor that the "fall of Brezhnev is expected," and the Chinese dream of an about-turn and prepare secret plans, perhaps in agreement with the Soviets. We shall see revisionist and traitor tricks.

[AU311715 0900 GMT 31 Oct 79 AU]

["'Reflections on China'—Extracts From the Political Diary by Comrade Enver Hoxha Leafing the Pages of the Second Volume"—ATA headline; Part Five. See JPRS 73890 of 24 July 1979, No 1701 and JPRS 74000 of 13 Aug 79 No 1707 of the EAST EUROPE REPORT on Extracts from Volume 1.]

[Text] Tirana, October 31, ATA--In the note of Wednesday, February 24, 1976 Comrade Enver Hoxha explains the reasons of the confusion which prevailed in the Chinese leadership in that time and the right-wing policy pursued. By Mao Zedong about the international problems. The note is entitled: Chinese Puzzle, Maoist Confusion.

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: Something is brewing in China. After the funeral of Zhou Enlai a great campaign began against the rightists, against "the main people in the leadership who have taken the capitalist road," against those who "were opposed to the cultural revolution," against those who "were rehabilitated and recommenced the struggle against the line of the great helmsman." The newspapers and magazines have been full of articles which expose this trend, this "plague." In line with the Chinese custom, at the moment no one is being named, but the labels the "second Khrushchev of China," "the main one after Liu Shaoqi," "an enemy like Liu and Lin," etc, are being used. It is evident that the reference is to Deng Xiaoping. He has not appeared on the scene for a month, his glory has faded, the welcoming and farewell ceremonies which he performed as Zhou Enlai's deputy-premier are now done by another, called Feng or Fan, whose name we have not yet learned, because these people are promoted today and brought down tomorrow. This is Mao's tactic: He is not exposing Deng, but neither is he counting the new one as premier.

But what has changed in all this disorder? What is changing? Are the people, the policy, or the ideology changing? These, especially the foreign policy, which ideology impels and leads, are moving more and more to the right. Nothing is shifting. The Americans are friends of the Chinese, the Soviets enemies. But in Mao's pro-American policy unimaginable and astonishing things can be seen, too. At a time when the "leftist campaign" is being developed, and China is seething like a cauldron, the former American President, Nixon, the Watergate rogue, the savagely anti-communist and fascist, is invited to CVA, welcomed by the premier with a great suite of thousands of peoples, who meet him at the airport, waving American flags and cheering....

This is the Chinese puzzle, the Maoist confusion.

The whole world does not understand why this is being done, and it can be excused for not understanding, but I shall give my explanation. Mao is not in his right mind and neither are the comrades close to him. He thinks that he is pursuing a great and clever policy. His aim and strategy is to deepen the contradictions between the United States of America and the Soviet Union. According to him the main enemy is the Soviet Union, therefore we must gather the forces against it. Mao says, "The war between the United States of America and the Soviet Union will be waged in Europe."

With Nixon, Mao was more certain that this strategy of his would be applied, but in fact, in getting involved with Nixon, "He has done himself in the eve." Meanwhile with Ford he is not certain, therefore he received him coldly. And for his part, Ford took a stand openly against Mao's strategy,

then, in order "to shake up Ford and the United States of America" and to win the support of all the fascist governments and fascist statesmen in Europe and everywhere, who are implicated in the new scandal about bribes which they have received from Nixon and his government, the "genius" Mao invites Nixon to China and receives him with great pomp, just as if he were president. And in fact, with what Mao is doing he wants to say that he is not in agreement with the accusations levelled against the "marvellous" Nixon and "if you Americans want good relations with China, you must follow the policy of Nixon, who even though not president, urges the American concerns to make big deals with socialist China." Meanwhile, Mao tells the whole world: "What are you worrying me for...I am the representative of a great state and I know what I am doing"....

We cannot find any other explanation of these things.

Today is troubled, who knows what the morrow will bring.

In the note of Wednesday, March 3, 1976 Comrade Enver Hoxha writes about the chaos reigning in China as well as about the ever greater rapprochement of the Chinese leadership with American imperialism. He writes:

The drums are beating loudly in China against "the new Khrushchev of China," against "rightist enemies," "agents of the Kuomintang," against those "who have tried to seize power," "who have created splits in the Central Committee of the party," "who are against the road of Mao Zedong," etc. Who is this enemy? Deng Xiaoping "the little bit of gold," as Mao called him, whom the Cultural Revolution exposed as "the number two enemy of China" after Liu Shaoqi, and whom, three years ago, Mao not only rehabilitated but appointed first deputy-premier, in fact almost premier (because Zhou was dying), and also appointed him a member of the political bureau, vice-chairman of the party and chief of the general staff, and now? And now--patatras--(crash [French onomatopoeic word]). The house of cards, the cult of Deng collapsed. They say Mao overthrew him. But why raise him and then bring him down? "Because he was plotting, because his self-criticism was a fraud." "The great helmsman" is very vigilant....

The Chinese policy has its own special ideology with a Chinese name, has its own tactics and strategy, likewise Chinese. No one knows what tomorrow will bring, while today is chaos. On the one hand, the Chinese people "are struggling" against the rightists, and on the other hand they were bursting with incontainable joy and unrestrained enthusiasm for the fascist, the trickster--the former president of the United States of America, Nixon. This is the policy of the "genius" Mao. It is hard to make head or tail of it all: Mao was pro-Khrushchev, then he turned against him, especially when the latter went to Washington, later Mao personally kissed Nixon, Zhou, who was more with Liu and Khrushchev, united with Mao against Khrushchev and pro the United States of America. Then came Teng who, as a collaborator of Liu, must have been pro-Soviet, but became pro-American, because he had to disguise himself, to pose as if he was with Mao at every moment.

What will happen now? What Mao will say—they say that the leftists are taking power, but their kisses with America are becoming more clinging, allegedly because "poor America has been weakened and requires help," since the Soviets are becoming dangerous.

### Where Has China Been and Where Is It Going?

In the note dated: Vlora, Thursday, April 1, 1976 Comrade Enver Hoxha analyses in detail and exposes through convincing arguments the anti-Marxist line of the Chinese revisionist leadership with Mao Zedong at the head, which aimed at transforming China into a social-imperialist superpower.

China, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes, has been and is called "Chung Kuo" by the Chinese, which means in French "L'Empire du Milieu" (this is how it was also called in ancient times), which means the "middle empire." But why the "middle empire"? Because for scores of centuries on end the Chinese considered their country the "centre of the world "

It is understandable that this word Chung Kuo, which is still used by the Chinese today, is not just a simple traditional name, but the outcome of the formation of a world outlook through thousands of years, through all the Chinese generations, which, consciously or unconsciously, is preserved even today.

During the centuries, however, and especially in our times, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, the character, beliefs and customs of people changes, underwent a profound evolution, but without entirely losing their old features. Even after the final liberation from the foreign yoke, after the creation of the Peoples Republic of China, and after the revolution led by the Communist Party of China, China still remained, to some extent, a "closed" country. Under the disguise of the peoples democratic régime, and under the guidance and leadership of the Communist Party of China and Mao Zedong despite the radical changes its people carried out, China still remained diffident, created "friendships" at this or that juncture, closed its doors, or kept them closed to progressive world culture, and tried to do everything, to carry out each step in its evolution in an "air-tight jar." Everything foreign, including the Marxist-Leninist theory, which was adopted as "the guiding idea," underwent changes in the form of eclecticism, allegedly applied in the conditions of China.

China's being shut away in itself, kept Mao and Zhou shut up in this environment. They did not see beyond China, and certainly in their initial notions, which led towards the revolution, many national, bourgeois, democratic, progressive and mystical views were combined. Things, both at that time and now, are left obscure, there are all sorts of opinions and interpretations, therefore, "Make your choice and take your pick."



### Mao Was Working To Raise His Own Cult

There are many things we do not know, but we do know that the Communist Party of China trumpets "in petto" (in secret--Italian in the original): The Comintern made mistakes over China, Stalin made mistakes (and according to Mao, the Communist Party of The Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) has acknowledged the mistakes), the Soviet Union issued the directive that the Communist Party of China should collaborate with the Kuomintang when it should not have done so, etc., etc. All these things are whispered in the corners and around the corridors and I think that they have the objective of elevating Mao, "who has never made mistakes," and downgrading Stalin, "who made mistakes."

The attitude of Mao and his comrades towards the Soviet Union in the time of Stalin makes one suspicious. It has not been correct and sincere. We at least, do not know of any grudges having been displayed, especially on the part of Stalin, the Soviet Union and the Comintern, during the time of China's liberation war. Kang Sheng, one of the finest Marxist-Leninist revolutionary leaders of China, was the representative of the Communist Party of China in the Comintern, and he never had a bad word to say in this direction.

We considered post-liberation China a state of peoples democracy, led by a glorious Communist Party, at the head of which was a great Marxist-Leninist, who was called Mao Zedong. Like all our countries which were liberated and established the order of peoples democracy, China, too, was closely linked with the Soviet Union and Stalin. Later, we learned many things about the ups and downs of the Communist Party of China and the Kuomintang, about the "long march," about Mao's friendship with foreign officers and journalists, like the American Edgar Snow and others who stayed at his headquarters. We learned of the "fruitful" contacts of Mao and Zhou with Vandemeyer and Marshall, who organized the American aid to Mao and Chiang, as well as about the China lobbies in Washington. Of course, these things made an impression on us, but we considered them simply tactics, and not a tendency towards the United States of America, such as became apparent later.

Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha continues?

Mao was against Stalin and that he, together with his comrades, worked to build up his own cult. The aim was that Mao was to take the place of Stalin, "brought down and besmirched" by the traitors, in the line-up of great Marxists in the international communist movement. He thought that for the sake of the aid which he was giving Khrushchev on this occasion, Khrushchev would favour the new cult of Mao and China would become the centre of the revolution. "The east wind is blowing," "the east is red," "Mao Zedong is the sun of the world"--these were the slogans which the Chinese propaganda issued at that time.

But things did not go as Mao thought and desired. Soviet revisionism and Khrushchev gave him a cold shoulder. Mao and the Maoists tried to avoid a clash, but things could take no other course. Then the tactics of Mao Zedong

changed. The boosting of the cult of Mao Zedong as "a great Marxist-Leninist" who fought against modern revisionism, and, first of all, against Soviet modern revisionism, and at the same time against American imperialism and against the reactionary world bourgeoisie, continued. Such a struggle was correct, therefore we supported it and the Chinese supported us. But in fact they employed this tactic not from the class standpoint and not in the Marxist-Leninist way. With this tactic, the Chinese wanted and tried to strengthen the position of China in the communist movement and among the peoples in the world as "a truly socialist state, irreconcilable with the class enemies and the enemies of the peoples who are fighting for liberation." Meanwhile, within their party, Mao and the Maoists had to fight the rightist faction of Liu Shaoqi, Zhou Enlai, Deng Xiaoping, etc., who, under the shadow of Mao, were fighting for the re-establishment of capitalism and aimed to change the policy towards friendship with the Khrushchevites.

Mao Zedong found himself between two fires, which in fact he had kindled himself, with the aim of achieving his objective of turning China into a great world power. Thus, he found himself between the Soviet revisionists and the dangerous faction of Liu Shaoqichi. Then he launched the Cultural Revolution, about which I shall say nothing here because I have said and written a great deal about it.

#### Why Did the Switch of China Towards American Imperialism Occur?

We, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, did not consider the line of the isolation of China in the international arena correct. We had presented our views officially to Li Xiennian, reasoning that the struggle must be continued sternly against the two superpowers, while China ought to open up to peoples and other states, because in this way we would split our main enemies and defeat their slanderous propaganda against our countries. However, the Chinese stuck to their positions and did not follow this reasonable road which was in China's interests, our interests, and those of the other peoples of the world. The Chinese amazed us with their stands. In this case they proved to be sectarian instead of liberal. Liberalism and sectarianism are brother and sister. China completely ignored Europe, maintained hostile stands towards the countries of Asia, and had laid down recognition of Taiwan as a part of the Chinese territory, as a precondition for the establishment of normal relations with the various states. Meanwhile, it published a propaganda article in RENMIN RIBAO about Africa and the Latin-American countries once in a blue moon. In the international arena the policy of China was a rigid, sectarian, megalomaniacal and xenophobic policy of isolation to the point of, so to say, undeclared "yellow racism."

When we were worrying about all these things the bombshell of Kissinger's secret visit to China and his secret talks with Mao and Zhou was dropped. China began a new period, a new policy, still wrong, the rightist policy of rapprochement with the Americans, but which was to go much beyond that, to rapprochement with the fascists, Franco in Spain and Pinochet in Chile.

It became clear that the reasons which had "hindered" China in opening up relations with other states of the world had not been the recognition of the island of Taiwan as part of the Chinese territory. This problem melted away as if by magic and the United States of America began its links and agreements with China without, in fact, making any concession on Taiwan up till now. We, as the comrades we were, opposed the secret contacts and agreements with the United States of America and Nixon's going to China, telling them that this friendship which the Chinese were establishing with American imperialism would bring nothing but harm to China, to socialism and to the whole world. As I have written earlier, to our letter on this question, as well as to letters on other questions, Mao Zedong did not even deign to reply.

Why did this switch of China towards American imperialism occur? For the reason that Mao and Zhou were revisionists, liberals and opportunists, and their policy was a pragmatic policy with the aim of building China up to a superpower. In order to achieve this, according to Mao and Zhou, China had to rely on the revisionist Soviet Union or on American imperialism. The fight on two flanks meant nothing to Mao. According to him, "China had to rely on one superpower to fight the other, and have others to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for it." The Soviet Union did the same thing. And it did not agree to link itself up with China, because, obviously, the Soviet Union did not agree to be dominated by China. Mao, for his part, was unable to achieve the aim that the Soviet Union should serve China. The Soviet Union turned towards the United States of America, a wealthy superpower, from which it could get credits and thus establish its hegemony. The United States of America, for its part, accepted this in order to redive the spheres of influence with the Soviet Union.

China did nothing original. And seeing that the aim which it had towards the Soviet Union had failed, it turned to the United States of America, to Mao's old friendship. Zhou wanted fame, wanted domination. Both of them, Mao and Zhou were revisionists. They prepared their new policy.

The United States of America became the arbiter of the world, it would manoeuvre both towards the Soviet Union and towards China, of course, in its own interests. The United States of America measured its stands towards both of them carefully, and is still doing so, in order to weaken the Soviet Union, and to manoeuvre to use China, too, against the Soviet Union, and this is what is occurring. China effectively ceased the struggle against the United States of America and intensified its propaganda against the Soviet Union to absurdity. I say propaganda, because there are no ideological articles from China for the exposure of the Soviet Union. At these moments the line of China is: "Our main enemy is the Soviet Union." Whoever comes out against the Soviet Union is the friend of China, even if he is a fascist.

#### China is Heading Towards a New Social-Imperialism

China has developed its links with all the capitalist countries of the world and officially declared itself to be a member of the "third world." The

doors of China have been thrown open to the Presidents of the United States of America, to the monarchs, princes, princesses, prime ministers, senators, parliamentary groups, businessmen, to every Tom, Dick and Harry. The doors of China have been closed only to official Albanian delegations.

Where is China heading with this line? Towards a new social-imperialism, towards the seizure of power by the capitalist, both new and old, whom the opportunist line of Mao has kept in power, protected and strengthened.

#### The Chinese Line Is Rightist

This is the title of the note of Saturday, June 12, 1976, in which Comrade Enver Hoxha exposes the anti-Marxist, rightist line of the Chinese leadership. He writes:

Even if one were a Chinese, it would be hard to understand the internal and foreign policy of China. It has not a stable line and swings as much to one side as to the other.

China linked itself with American imperialism against the Soviets, and this position led it further down the anti-Marxist, rightist road.

It is understandable that the Chinese and Mao could not be in agreement with us, and this they have demonstrated and are demonstrating in deeds. We are keeping cool. In the line of China, the helm is turned to the right, Mao and Zhou Enlai rehabilitated Deng Xiaoping and, instead of being "the number two enemy," he became the vice-chairman of the Communist Party of China and meanwhile was being trained to take the place of Zhou Enlai. Zhou died, and Deng did not become premier, but was described as a revisionist and a traitor. What has not been and is not being said against him--astonishing accusations. They appear to be correct, but the question arises: What was Mao doing that he rehabilitated this person? But even after these accusations which are being levelled at Deng, no positive Marxist-Leninist stand is apparent in the foreign and internal policy of China. Great confusion once again. Hua Guofeng says there will be no change in the foreign policy of China and, moreover that the former direction will be further strengthened.

[AU011525 0900 GMT 1 Nov 79 AU]

["'Reflections on China'--Extracts From the Political Diary by Comrade Enver Hoxha Leafing the Pages of the Second Volume"--ATA headline; Part Six. See JPRS 73890 of 24 July 1979, No 1701 and JPRS 74000 of 13 Aug 79 No 1707 of the EAST EUROPE REPORT on Extracts from Volume I.]

[Text] Tirana, November, ATA--On Wednesday, October 13, 1976 Comrade Enver Hoxha writes among others in his notes about the unprincipled, anti-Marxist and revisionist policy of a "great state" pursued by China. The noted is entitled: Great Chaos in China.



For two or three days, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, the Western and revisionist news agencies have been saying that a coup d'etat has been staged in China and those that have come to power are the "moderates," as they call Hua Guofeng and company, with whom Li Xiannian has appeared also. For us, the "moderates" are the partisans of Zhou Enlai, the revisionists, who have rejected the Marxist-Leninist ideology on almost all questions, while disguising themselves with deafening demagoguery. They have applied and are applying a great-state chauvinist policy, follow a pro-American foreign policy. This policy which Zhou Enlai followed, was at the same time the policy of Mao too.

Mao cannot be separated from Zhou Enlai. They acted hand in glove. They were both liberals and, under the mask of Marxism-Leninism, tried to create a great power and to carry out a "big policy" in the international arena, appropriate to the size of China. In other words they intended that China should become an intermediary force which would balance the weight of the two superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union. The aim of the Chinese leadership, continues Comrade Enver Hoxha, was to assist Khrushchev and the Khrushchevites to establish themselves after the coup d'etat which they carried out in the Soviet Union in order to overthrow the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. The aim of Mao Zedong, Zhou Enlai and others, was, at the same time, that, with the aid of the Soviet Union, China would become a great power and Mao Zedong would take the place after Lenin, i.e. enter the rank of the great classics, who according to them, were: Marx, Engels, Lenin, Mao Zedong. To this end, of course, he had to butter up Khrushchev and assist him. He did this not just secretly but even openly, not only in the lobbies but even at international meetings of communist and workers parties at which we too, were present. We heard with our own ears what Mao Zedong said about the activities of Khrushchev. Nothing but praise.

However, with the passage of time and the development of events, things did not happen as Mao Zedong had thought. Khrushchev was truly a clown, an anti-Marxist and a great intriguer, but he was not so stupid as to put the Soviet Union under the wing of China and Mao Zedong. On the contrary, he wanted and worked for the Soviet Union to become an imperialist power with great military potential, and thus turn into a strong partner of the United States of America, so that the two of them could divide up the world and exploit it in their own interests.

Hence, despite all their efforts, the dream of Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai did not become reality. In a word, they were both day-dreaming. Then, as I have explained at other times, they took a 180 degree turn, trained their "batteries" on the revisionist Soviet Union, a thing in which we were interested, but at the same time turned their faces to American imperialism and shook the hand of the fascist President, Nixon. Hence the other dream of Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai was that, in close collaboration with American imperialism and relying on it, China should become a great social-imperialist power. If all that the foreign agencies are saying about China is true, this will inflict colossal damage on the world revolution and socialism, and

set it back by many years. China itself will proceed on the road of the social-imperialist great power. It will rely for the present on the United States of America, but it will not be surprising if, later, it carries out the same policy as Tito, that is, to achieve its objective, it will stretch out its hand towards the Soviet Union. Regardless of the fact that at present China is conducting "deafening" propaganda against Khrushchevite modern revisionism, this is a victory for the Soviet Union, too. Tomorrow it may gradually tone down this propaganda, with China's becoming an independent power, with a big industry, which is being built up with American technology, with a stock of atomic bombs inferior to that of the Soviet Union, but with a great army, overwhelmingly bigger than that of the Soviet Union, it is possible, and I think it might happen, that three superpowers may be created in the world, and the three of them will want to have their spheres of influence. Naturally, the contradictions between them will increase, a time will come when they become acute, and we shall be witnesses to this exacerbation which may lead to another world war.

#### **Mao Shifts According to Circumstances, as the Revisionist Interests of Chinese State Require**

Analysing Mao Zedong's speech: "On the ten major relationships," Comrade Enver Hoxha, in the note of Tuesday, December 28, 1976 dwells on the revisionist theses of Mao on the relations of China with other countries:

The tenth and final point of the "decatalogue," writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, treats relations between China and other countries. These relations, as he explains them and raises them to theses, are opportunist, revisionist relations. Their purpose is to avoid applying a correct revolutionary line in China, in aid of the world proletariat and the world revolution, in aid of the Marxist-Leninist communist parties, so that they prevent them from fighting successfully against the bourgeoisie, capitalism and modern revisionism. In fact Mao is a modern revisionist just like the Soviet, Tito and other revisionists.

In connection with the foreign policy of China, the famous theses of Mao Zedong says: "Our policy is to learn from the strong points of all nations and all countries, learn all that is good in the political, economic, scientific and technological fields and in literature and art." This is his whole policy. In order to do this, according to Mao Zedong, peaceful coexistence (revisionist) must be established with all the states of the world. For Mao there is no distinction between these states. Later, ignoring the socio-economic order which exists in one or the other country, Mao Zedong divided the world in three and is for the strategy of "three worlds." He is not against any "world." He does not make any distinction even in the "first world" in which Mao puts imperialist America and the social-imperialist Soviet Union. Now he is pro-American imperialism, tomorrow he might be against it, today he is against Soviet social-imperialism, tomorrow he might be for it, hence he shifts according to circumstances, as the revisionist interests of the Chinese state require and does not act on the basis of the Marxist-

Leninist principles, does not think that the imperialist powers must be combated and the peoples' national liberation struggle supported.

With this line Mao Zedong cannot defend the peoples' national liberation struggle. Let him indulge in demagogy and declare that "We, the Chinese, are with the peoples of the third world," but these are mere words. Since he enunciates the tactic I mentioned above, since he is with American imperialism with which he does not want to fall out, because he must "learn" from it and get credits from it, either openly or secretly, Mao Zedong cannot be with the peoples of the so-called third world who are fighting against American imperialism, cannot help them to escape from the yoke of American imperialism. Through demagogy he tries to appear as a defender of states which are under the influence of Soviet social-imperialism, but he does this so that they come under the influence either of China or of the United States of America.

Pursuing an anti-Marxist strategy, Mao allowed Nixon to go to China without that state being officially recognized by the USA, likewise, to facilitate the visit of the American President, he agreed to remove the barrier of the question of Taiwan, which had been raised like a steel wall to any country which wanted to establish diplomatic relations with China. Since that time no more has been said about Taiwan. With this he is telling the United States of America that it can stay in Taiwan, in Japan, in Okinawa, Burma and elsewhere, and China and the present Chinese revisionist leaders have based the whole of their foreign policy and defence on this strategy of Mao's. Of course, the Chinese leadership must have agreed that the Americans could stay in South Vietnam, too, and the war cease, that the Vietnamese should establish friendship with the Americans. This must have been why the opposition arose between the Chinese and the Vietnamese, who, at one time, declared openly, "We (the Vietnamese) do not allow any other state to meddle in our internal affairs...."

It seems that the pro-American faction in China will triumph.

This is the title of the note of Monday, January 3, 1977 in which Comrade Enver Hoxha, analysing the situation in China during that period, writes:

The street walls, especially in Peking, are being covered with dazibaos exerting pressure on the Hua Guofeng group for Deng Xiaoping to be completely rehabilitated and assume the functions of premier, vice-chairman of the party and chief of the general staff. Nothing more, only the main keys of China. In other words, all the powers of his patron, Zhou Enlai, who rehabilitated him and trained him to take his place.

There must be two trends in the group of Zhou: One pro-Deng, and one pro-Hua Guofeng. The factional fight is now centered on these two trends. In strong opposition to each other are these two lines: the line of Deng and the line of Hua, both of them rightist, the one extreme and against Mao on some things, the other more moderate, and allegedly pro-Mao on some

other things. One line demands the full rehabilitation of Deng, while the other line accepts this, but after he "first makes self-criticism and provided he does not become premier of the State Council."

But in this great chaos of rivalries, Comrade Enver Hoxha stresses, the policy of the two superpowers also plays a role. Each of them defends its own partisans in China and builds up a "mirage" for them of how to get out of the economic chaos and become militarily strong. I judge that the pro-American faction will triumph because the United States of America is in a position to give China economic and military aid. The Chinese propaganda that "the United States of America has been weakened" is false and serves as a screen to hide the big deals which China is making with imperialism.

### Day by Day the Chinese Leadership is Sliding Into the Abyss

In the note of Wednesday, January 5, 1977 Comrade Enver Hoxha analyses the pseudo theory of Mao Zedong of "three worlds" exposing its counter-revolutionary character. He writes:

No doubt, in order to attack our correct ideological and political thesis against the "third world," which was put forward at the 7th congress, two or three days ago the Chinese wrote a long allegedly theoretical article divided into chapters. Not only was the article referred to not in the least theoretical, but, as the problem was presented there, it was also wrong.

The aim of this article was quite clear: "To prove" that the division into "three worlds" is an "invention of the genius of Mao Zedong." They want Mao Zedong's paternity of this absurd and anti-Marxist invention of the division of the world in opposition to the division made by Marx and Lenin, to be acknowledged. The bourgeoisie and Khrushchev originally gave birth to this "love-child," but nevertheless the Maoists want to adopt it. Let them have it.

With this article the Chinese want "to prove" that this offspring of theirs, the "third world," has scored great successes and the situation there is "excellent."

However, the Chinese make no effort to explain this "third world" because they have no way to justify it theoretically from the Marxist-Leninist angle.

But what is this undefined "third world," or perhaps defined by the Chinese, scoring these "brilliant successes"? "There is no doubt," say the Chinese, "over Soviet social-imperialism." Hence, each paragraph of this article speaks only against the Soviet Union, because, according to the Chinese, it alone is the cause of all evils. But what does this article say about American imperialism? Not much, it says only that the Soviet Union has contradictions with the United States of America. But why does it have these contradictions, and what do these contradictions consist of?



The article does not say, because it does not want to say anything against the United States of America. Hence, China is defending the United States of America. But what about the problem of classes and the class struggle within these states of the so-called third world--do they touch on this problem, explain it, or even mention it? Not at all. This has been eliminated completely for the sake of the struggle against the Soviet Union and the defence of the United States of America and its cliques which are in power in the majority of the states of the "third world." But what are these cliques for the Chinese? When they take the side of the United State of America they are "free and sovereign democrats and nationalists." What is going on with the peoples in these countries and what must those who are suffering, who are oppressed, and who are out of work there, do? What do the Chinese advise them? For the Chinese these peoples are herds of animals, without personality, are only peoples of the "third world" who must simply tolerate the internal and external yoke of American imperialism and fight against Soviet social-imperialism.

Day by day the Chinese revisionist leaders are slipping deeper into the abyss. Neither the Marxists, nor the revolutionaries, nor the progressive people are deceived by these allegedly Marxist-Leninist theories. With such palaver, saying that within China "the situation is excellent" when it is chaotic, or saying that "the situation in the world is excellent" when the world is threatened with the danger of imperialist war and enslavement for the peoples, the credit of the Chinese will hit rock-bottom. But it is better thus, than that lies and revisionism should triumph.

#### **The Line of the C.P. of China Is Antiproletarian, Warmongering**

In the note of Saturday, January 8, 1977 Comrade Enver Hoxha proves through convincing arguments that the line the Chinese revisionist leadership pursues is neither new, nor original, but a revival of the Second International on anti-proletarian, warmongering line.

The main issue for the Chinese, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, is to convince people by whispering in their ears that the United States has been weakened economically and militarily, its internal and foreign debts have increased greatly, things have reached the point that other capitalist countries are investing in the United States of America and that country is no longer strong as it was before. This is a false, unfounded analysis and it is presented in an attempt to prove something which cannot be proved. They want to prove that allegedly the United States of America is no longer aggressive, that, according to the Chinese, it is merely trying to hang on to what it has gained, that it wants to maintain the status quo, and therefore, for the world "the main enemy is Soviet revisionism which wants expansion." This is one of the theses of the Chinese, and one of their main ones. They accuse us of allegedly not making a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the international situation and of the contradictions between the two superpowers, and that is why we do not follow the road of the Chinese of calling on

"United Europe" the European Common Market and the world proletariat to unite against the Soviets. It emerges as their "conclusion" that we allegedly favour Soviet social-imperialism. Not only is this a revisionist thesis dressed up as anti-revisionism, but it is also hostile and slanderous towards us.

American imperialism is aggressive, bellicose and warmongering, and no thesis opposed to this can stand against the facts. The Americans' bases, the American's credits, the great increase in their armaments, the pro-American cliques which have been established everywhere, prove that the American imperialists want not only the status quo but also expansion, otherwise there is no reason why there should be such profound contradictions between them and the Soviet Union, while the Chinese claim the opposite. "The Soviet Union wants war," say the Chinese, "while the United States of America does not," and they imply that the quotation from Mao: "The United States of America has become like a rat and the whole world is shouting in the streets 'Kill the rat'" shows this. This also shows the softness on the part of the Chinese and indirectly appeals to us to refrain from attacking a state like the United States of America, which has now been reduced to a rat.

Can this strategy of Mao's be called Marxist?

Today the Chinese are doing precisely what the Second International did-- the strategy of Mao Zedong "based on a Marxist-Leninist analysis" has definitively determined that "the rivalry between the two superpowers lies in Europe." Astonishing. Why does it not lie at some weaker point of the world, too, where the Soviet Union is seeking expansion, as in Asia, Africa, Australia, or Latin America? The tradition of the colonialists has been to move in at the weak points. And the imperialists launch their predatory wars for hegemony, for new markets and for a new division of the world. Is the main rivalry not that between the United States of America and the revisionist Soviet Union? Then, according to the Chinese, these two superpowers, one of which wants the status quo and the other expansion, will reach the point of launching the war in Europe, as Hitler did in his time, because he wanted expansion. But in order to achieve this, he had to conquer France, Britain and the Soviet Union. For these reasons he began the war in Europe, and not elsewhere. Stalin entered into alliance with Britain and the United States after Germany had attacked the Soviet Union and not before. But the Chinese take the tactic which Stalin was obliged to use in those conditions as an argument to say: Why should they not rely on the United States of America in this coming war?

None of these things confirms the thesis of the Chinese on the alliances which they advocate, but they all confirm the opposite. When the Germany of William II attacked France and Britain, and the Second International advocated "defence of the fatherland" (bourgeois) on the part of both the German socialists and the French socialists, although the war had an imperialist character from both sides. Everybody knows how this was condemned by Lenin and what he said against imperialist wars and about turning them into

civil wars. Today, when the Chinese make their pronouncement about the defence of "United Europe" they are doing precisely what the Second International did. They are inciting the future nuclear war which the two superpowers want to launch and, although this war between the two superpowers cannot be anything other than an imperialist war, they are appealing to the "patriotism" of the peoples of Western Europe, of its proletariat, to put aside "their minor issues" with the bourgeoisie (and these "minor issues" are oppression, hunger, strikes, killings, unemployment, the inviolability of the bourgeois state), and to unite with NATO, "United Europe," the European Common Market of the big bourgeoisie of the concerns and fight against the Soviet Union, to become cannon fodder for the bourgeoisie.

The Second International could have done no better in its propaganda. Is this a Leninist stand?

But what does China advise the peoples of the Soviet Union and those of the other revisionist countries which take part in the Warsaw Treaty and COMECON to do? Nothing. With its silence it says to them: "Keep quiet, fight and shed your blood for the bloodthirsty clique of the Kremlin"...is this a Leninist stand?...no.... This line of the Communist Party of China is anti-proletarian, warmongering.

The Chinese are not for fighting on the two flanks, against both imperialist superpowers, to foil their plans of predatory war, and do not want anyone to work so that if war breaks out, it will be turned into a civil war, into a just war. This is precisely the Leninist teaching which we follow, and that is why the Chinese accuse us of having illusions about peace, and of carrying grist to the mill of the Soviets....

The Chinese slander us, saying that we overrate the collaboration of the United States of America with the Soviet Union and underrate the contradictions between them. They say, likewise, that "the Albanians stress that the two superpowers, both the one and the other, are equally dangerous." The former charge is not true, while the latter statement is completely correct. Not only do we recognize and make a correct assessment of the contradictions which exist between the two superpowers but we struggle to make them deeper. In all our documents these problems are properly defined.

The Chinese do not have much to say about the fact that the two superpowers are in complete agreement in their opposition to socialism, communism and the peoples' liberation. The slanders and sophistry of the Chinese are unable to conceal the revisioning of Marxism-Leninism on their part, or to attack the correct line and stands of our party. The Chinese declare openly that the Americans tell them: "Beware, because the Soviet Union will attack you." This means: "You Chinese need have no fear of us Americans, because your alliance with the United States of America is on the right course." And on the basis of this instruction the Chinese pursue a policy of "genius": "We must tell the Soviet Union to attack Europe, and indirectly we shall also weaken the United States of America and its allies, and thus we shall triumph"...Chinese tricks....

Lenin's thesis remains unshakeable. Another important question: In order to camouflage their incitement of the future imperialist war, and to defend their thesis of "United Europe," the Chinese are trying to refute Lenin's clear opinion in connection with "United Europe" which we cited at the 7th congress of our party. They claim that in basing themselves on Lenin to refute the thesis about "United Europe" the Albanians are "beating the air because Lenin expressed this opposition to a European federation between Russia, Austria, and Britain which were imperialists." And they add, "We (the Chinese) are referring to the union of the countries of Western Europe." This means that to the Chinese, the capitalist countries of Western Europe are not reactionary...however, these "United States of Europe" themselves are saying everyday that if they unite, they cannot fail to comprise an imperialist entity. Which are these states? They are precisely the ones about which the Chinese say, "They have become so powerful that they are even investing in the United States of America"....

Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha underlines: "The Agency of Labour of Albania is not in agreement with us when we concentrate our fire on the Soviet Union," say the Chinese. This is a slander. We are against their stand, because they do not concentrate the same fire against the United States of America, too. We are for the fire to be concentrated just as strongly against the United States of America as it is against the Soviet Union. Why do the Chinese leaders never admit openly that the Soviet Union could attack China, too, as they claim about Western Europe? But the Chinese say only: "The Soviet Union will attack Europe." Why do they feel themselves so secure on their Eastern borders? We, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, have the right to ask this question and to raise this problem for discussion.

In regard to the theory of "three worlds," we analysed it at the congress and consider it, as we have stated, a fictitious, non-class, non-Marxist division. Lenin made analyses of the international situation after the First World War and later, but he wrote that there are two worlds: "the capitalist world and our socialist world." The Chinese say: "Since the Soviet Union and a number of former socialist countries betrayed and turned into capitalist countries, the socialist system has disappeared." No, the socialist system has not disappeared, it exists and is advancing in the genuine socialist countries which remain loyal to Marxism-Leninism, such as the People's Socialist Republic of Albania. But even if no socialist state were left, Lenin's thesis remains unshakeable. Even in this case, two worlds would be created through struggle, through revolution, hence they would exist.

The trend of the peoples of the world is towards the struggle for liberation, for revolution, for socialism. But all the cliques of those states of the "third world" cannot be lumped together for this course. China places itself in the "third world" just as Tito places himself in the "non-aligned world," and both of them are competing to sell the most "entry tickets" to their particular worlds.



Our view, in the analysis we make, is based on the class division of the world which Lenin made. This analysis does not hinder us from fighting against the two superpowers and assisting all the peoples and the states which are demanding liberation and which have contradictions with the two superpowers.

[AU051000 0900 GMT 2 Nov 79 AU]

["'Reflections on China'--Excerpts From the Political Diary by Comrade Enver Hoxha--Leafing the Pages of the Second Volume"--ATA headline; Part Seven. See JPRS 73890 of 24 July 1979, No 1701 and JPRS 74000 of 13 Aug 79 No 1707 of the EST EUROPE REPORT on Extracts From Volume I.]

[Text] Tirana, November 2, ATA--In the note of Sunday, January 16, 1977, Comrade Enver Hoxha exposes the vacillating strategy of the Chinese revisionist leadership in its foreign policy and argues in particular its reliance on American imperialism. In this note, which is entitled:

#### Why These Variations in the Chinese Strategy?

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: I think that the reliance of the Chinese on American imperialism is no fiction. With the meeting of Zhou Enlai, and later of Mao with Kissinger, with Nixon, with Schlesinger, and the whole lot of specialized groups of the Senate, of big financiers, and of the heavy industry of the United States, it is confirmed that this reliance is real.

Naturally, when they began their talks, both sides made concessions to each other. The objective of American imperialism is to have China on its side so that it does not go over to the side of the Soviet Union. China, of course, has its own aims, wants to become a superpower, and to balance the other two superpowers. However, for this it needs time, it needs means, it needs modern weapons, and as it now turns out, the Communist Party of China has chosen the course of relying on American imperialism.

Has China received aid from the United States of America? We have no facts, but we think it has received aid, we base this on what the American newspapers write, on the speeches of President Ford, on the allusions of Kissinger and on the official support for China on the part of Kissinger who said in a speech that if China was attacked by another power, then the balance in international relations would undergo a great change which would have important consequences. This is approximately what Kissinger said.

But why does the United States of America supply such things to China? Of course, it has its own strategic aims. The United States of America wants China to be armed, but to be armed for attack against the Soviet Union and not the United States of America. This means it will carefully consider what armaments to give China. The armaments, patents or models of armaments which the United States of America supplies will help China defend itself

from an eventual Soviet attack. Thus, the Americans do not exclude the possibility of a clash between China and the Soviet Union, indeed they desire such a thing, that is why they are helping China with armaments and fanning up the fury of Soviet imperialism.

The Americans are also aiming at another thing: If China is armed and confronts Soviet social-imperialism as a relatively strong power, then the United States of America thinks that the Soviet Union will have to withdraw forces from Europe to deploy them on the long border with China. On the other hand, by acting in this way, the United States of America will encourage its way of life and thinking among the Chinese peoples, as it has done in other countries. Because such substantial aid from the Americans, naturally, will win sympathy among the Chinese leadership and an old friendship will be revived in the Chinese Army, too. The American way of life and thinking will not fail to penetrate amongst the people, too. Therefore, in China the United States of America not only finds a big market for getting rid of its goods and for acquiring Chinese raw materials, but armaments will figure first of all amongst those goods which it will export, because the United States of America, like the Soviet Union, has become one of the biggest suppliers of arms to other countries.

Hence, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, China has judged that an eventual attack is more likely to come from the Soviet Union than from American imperialism. The latter has always understood this situation because in the two former world wars, being protected by the oceans, the fleet and weapons it possessed and its economic power, it has incited the others to fight, to kill and destroy one another, so that in the end it could profit from the blood shed by foreigners. Thus, American imperialism has always encouraged others to fight so that it might gain. This is what it is doing today with China--it is assisting China to strengthen itself and fight against the Soviet Union. The United States of America might even assist China during the war, but still it will be the blood of the Chinese and Soviet peoples that is shed, the war might be turned into a world war, as the two former ones were, and the United States of America might come in at the closing stages, after the others have suffered very great losses and achieved pyrrhic victories.

For its part, China is following the strategy of getting the most out of American imperialism, of not declaring war on the Soviet Union, and of pursuing such a policy that China will be considered the world arbiter to settle the problems. In this direction the Chinese view is based on the idea of the great state, on the size of the Chinese continent and the big Chinese population. Naturally, this policy is also based on the economic strength and military buildup which China intends to create during this period. Therefore it will not be surprising if Hua Guofeng, provided he remains in power, or whoever replaces him, recommends a "quiet and gentle" policy with the two superpowers. That is, China will avoid worsening its relations with the Soviet Union, have good relations with the United States of America, improve its relations with the Soviet Union later, and thus get aid from both of them, in order to develop its economic and military power in peace.

In this situation, therefore, it is possible that we shall witness a new turn in the policy of the Communist Party of China, I mean to say, a new strategy, different from the former ones, different from the early strategy: Struggle under the leadership of the Soviet Union against American imperialism, different from the strategy: struggle against American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism simultaneously, and different from the strategy: in unity with American imperialism struggle against the Soviet Union. It is possible that the Chinese will arrive at a new strategy: peace on the two flanks, friendship with the Soviet Union, friendship with the United States of America. As it now appears, China wants to follow such a strategy and might achieve it.

Naturally, we will never follow China on this course, even if we have to remain alone, but we think that these variations of the Chinese strategy will not raise its prestige in the world. The peoples and progressive mankind throughout the world will understand that the Party of Labour of Albania, a small party, has a consistently correct and stable Marxist-Leninist policy, and that Marxism-Leninism is an unerring theory.

#### The "Theory" of the "Third World" Ignores the Class Struggle

Under this title appears the note of Tuesday, January 23, 1977 in which Comrade Enver Hoxha dwells on the counter-revolutionary strategy of the theory of the "third world" which aims at quelling the class struggle on a national and international scale. He writes:

The theses that "the third world is the greatest and most powerful force which drives the revolution forward," etc., are anti-Marxist, counter-revolutionary theses presented by Mao Zedong and his Chinese disciples (all so-called Marxist). These theses drawn from "a Marxist-Leninist study of the world situation and its evolution," are a serious restraint on the world revolution and the national revolutions. China and its leader, Mao, who have gained a reputation for what they are not in fact, call themselves members of the "third world" and with this they aim to weaken the class struggle on a national and international scale even further.

Mao formulates his thesis of the "third world" in an anti-Marxist way and places himself in it in order to dominate it. He forgets the cliques of shahs, of monarchs, of fascist generals, the cliques of sheiks and emirs, and all the castes of India, Afghanistan, Pakistan, etc., who rule the peoples savagely and are so closely linked with the imperialist and social-imperialist powers.... If China ignores these close links, their aim and development, then its leaders are anti-Marxist. And this is what they are in fact.

How is it possible to confound the Marxist-Leninists, the countries and peoples who aspire to liberate themselves from bondage to national and international capital, with their oppressors, the ruling capitalist cliques?... How can there be any advance to liberation and revolution if the distinction

is not made and the struggle not waged between oppressors and oppressed, between exploiters and exploited?... With his theory of "three worlds" Mao Zedong not only does not make this distinction, but fights precisely to extinguish the class struggle, to ensure that it does not exist on the national and international level.

From anti-Leninist positions, Mao Zedong's China incites the struggle against the Soviet Union, and softens the struggle against the United States of America. This policy is utterly anti-Marxist, it incites imperialist world war, instead of weakening and smashing it, because all the suffering, the bloodshed, the misery, fall on the peoples. China is inciting predatory wars and restraining just revolutionary wars.

#### China Is Aiming To Become a Superpower

In the note dated Vlora, Saturday, March 5, 1977 Comrade Enver Hoxha exposes the aims of the Chinese revisionist leadership to transform China into a social-imperialist superpower.

For us, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, there is no doubt at all that China is in alliance with the United States of America. It seems that there is a secret agreement between these two countries on their joint struggle against Soviet social-imperialism. Hence China, which has built its strategy, or to put it better, which has altered its strategy, has taken no account of the interests of the world revolution and the peoples liberation, but has reckoned only to strengthen itself as a great social-imperialist state. In this framework, these two states aim to achieve the weakening of Soviet social-imperialism. This policy of China is expressed in its efforts to ensure that all the communists, the Marxist-Leninist parties and the national liberation movements in the world should consider Soviet social-imperialism, not only from the strategic aspect, but also from the tactical aspect, the main enemy, or the only enemy, which must be fought at all costs.

When it decided to give China credits in armaments, in industry and other directions, the United States of America calculated not only the great financial profits in this, but also major political gains, because China, with its weight and influence, carries on propaganda in favour of American imperialism, presenting it as a non-aggressive power. As long as China carries on in support of the imperialist and hegemonic policy of the United States of America, as long as China exacerbates its own conflict with the Soviet Union, and in this direction the United States of America is trying to deepen the contradictions between China and the Soviet Union, the aid of American imperialism serves to fuel the flames of these contradictions. It is for this reason that we say that the war that may be waged in Europe, could also be waged in Asia, because war is the offspring of imperialism and social-imperialism. Soviet social-imperialism is a power which is inciting war, which is preparing for war, just like the United States of America which likewise is preparing for war.



China has become entangled in the activities of these two superpowers in order to attain the objectives it has set itself to become a superpower, too. Naturally, its efforts to incite a third world war result from this and no one knows where this war will break out. With this course that China has taken it will break out in Europe or in China. In any case the United States of America will use others to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for it. With the alliance which it is forming with the United States of America, China is courting war between itself and the Soviet Union, between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Why do I say this? Because we can judge that, at present it is the two superpowers which are fighting for hegemonic positions in the world, fighting for markets, to absorb the wealth of other peoples, but on this course on which China has set out, it too will not fail to become a third partner in these aims and this policy.

As Marxist-Leninists, we must not follow the counter-revolutionary and anti-Marxist course of China, but must follow our own Marxist-Leninist revolutionary course. By fighting for this course, we have defended Marxism-Leninism and its purity, have defended the interests of our people, the interests of other peoples, their liberation, and have tried to undermine the imperialist atomic war which may burst out amongst these three partners that are fighting for hegemony while relying on one another. The support of these states for one another is always to the detriment of the world revolution, the socialist countries and the peoples liberation.

Not even the slightest defence can be seen in the Chinese press or the Chinese radio of the peoples national liberation movements, not a word is said or written about the powerful demonstration of the proletariat in all the capitalist countries, there is no mention of the struggle of the Marxist-Leninist parties in those countries. Yes, such propaganda has disappeared from the pages of the Chinese press. This stand supports its strategy in order to let the capitalist states and American imperialism know that China has ceased its revolutionary struggle and its aid to the peoples who are fighting for liberation.

#### **The Theory of "Three Worlds" Is Against The Proletarian Revolution**

This is the title of the note dated: Vlora, Tuesday, March 22, 1977. Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: The Chinese have activized all their forces in defence of the theory of "three worlds." In this direction they have set in motion a number of "Marxist-Leninist communist" parties, which are trying to demonstrate that the "third world" formulated by Mao Zedong is allegedly a world which is well-based theoretically and the main anti-imperialist and anti-social-imperialist force in the world. This is not true. The truth is what our party of labour says, that the proletariat and the peoples who are fighting for their liberation comprise the main force against the reactionary internal bourgeoisie, imperialism, social-imperialism.

The theory of "three worlds" is against the proletarian revolution, and replaces it with the bourgeois-democratic revolution. This anti-Marxist theory eliminates the decisive leading role of the proletariat in the revolution, lumps all the forces together under one umbrella or in one bag, calling them the "third world" and giving them that role and those attributes which these forces do not possess, and with this "word" denies the socialist world. This means that China denies that it is a socialist country, calls itself an "underdeveloped country" and not a socialist country. According to this theory, to be an underdeveloped country means to be a socialist country. This theory is simply anti-Marxist and reactionary, it means to consider all the underdeveloped countries with bourgeois capitalist systems as socialist countries. Why is China doing this? It seems to me that it is doing this not only to defend an incorrect ideological thesis, but in order to realize its secret objective--to lead all those states of Asia, Africa or Latin America, which it includes in this "world" to become their leadership by representing itself as their main defender. But in fact China is not defending anything, because it does not give any sort of aid, even economic aid, to these states which are bourgeois-capitalist states, the majority of them are linked with the United States of America and the capital of other imperialisms, or with the Soviet Union.

Hence the peoples who are fighting for liberation must strengthen their unity with the working class and, under the leadership of the working class, fight for their liberation from the internal capitalist bourgeoisie and its main props--American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

This means: Forget the wolf and fight its shadow [sentence as received]

In the note of Friday, April 29, 1977 Comrade Enver Hoxha mentions the instructions he has given about the publication of an article which would unmask the opportunist line of the Chinese revisionist leadership in connection with the theory of "three worlds." In this note he also condemns the aims of the Chinese leadership which calls on the peoples to follow the strategy of capital and stop the revolution. Comrade Enver Hoxha writes in this note:

I talked with Comrade Ramiz about a question which I consider opportune and important. We must write a theoretical article the essence of which is to unmask the content of the Chinese opportunist line in connection with the so-called theory of three worlds.

We see at present that the Chinese and their followers everywhere are making great use of the thesis of the "third world" in order to promote it as a "correct theory of national liberation struggles," and in this way, without saying so explicitly, they are denigrating and attacking the correct Marxist-Leninist line of our party and its 7th congress, which dealt with this problem in particular.

Basing themselves on some quotations from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, taken out of context, they are trying to explain (but are explaining nothing) their theory of the "third world" (which in fact denies the revolution).

In other words, in this article, without mentioning the Communist Party of China by name, we must expose the opportunist party of China by name, we must expose the opportunist views which it has raised at present in order to quell the revolution. China does not agree with the definition which the classics of Marxism-Leninism have made of our epoch, who said that after the victory of the Soviet Union, after the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the world has entered the epoch of proletarian revolutions. For China, mankind "is not living in this epoch," it pretends that we are still in the period of bourgeois-democratic revolutions.

It is precisely this question that we must explain clearly in this article. With the line it is following and the stands it adopts, China says "stop" to the revolution, stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha. It professes a new revisionism, which is a variant of modern revisionism, a markedly opportunist form of distortion of our Marxist-Leninist ideology. Its objective, in essence, in theory and in practice, is to hinder and stop the revolution, to preserve the status quo of the so-called free and independent states, which, in fact, are dominated by the local big capitalist cliques which are in alliance with American imperialism, and to arouse these states to fight against Soviet social-imperialism. "The fight" of this "third world," in which China has included itself, is carried out in alliance with American imperialism.

Thus China, with the aid of American imperialism, relying on it and posing as a member of the "third world" itself, wants to stop the revolution and to gain time so that it, too, can become a superpower.

The duty devolves upon us Albanian Marxist-Leninists to explain this line of China's and we shall make this explanation, basing ourselves, as always, on our great teachers, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, who have made these questions very clear. Not only at its 7th congress, but since the time it was founded, our party has always proceeded according to the teachings of our classics, has understood them correctly in theory, and has applied them correctly in practice, too.

Through this articles which we shall write we must make world opinion, and especially the Marxist-Leninists, clear about this fraudulent theory which the Chinese revisionists are spreading under the guise of Marxism-Leninism. According to them, since China is allegedly a socialist country and Mao Zedong a "great Marxist-Leninist," then the Marxist-Leninists of the whole world must follow everything he has said unquestioningly. This we do not accept.

We have to make and have made our analysis of the development of socialism in China in order to see what sort of socialism is developing and what forms are being used there on this course. From a long time back we have not been in agreement with the views of Mao Zedong, especially with his saying that "the countryside must encircle the city." We have never accepted this view of Mao Zedong's as a Marxist-Leninist view because in this way Mao Zedong considers the peasantry the most revolutionary class. This is an anti-Marxist view. The most revolutionary class of society is the proletariat.

Therefore it must lead the revolution in alliance with the peasantry, which is the most faithful ally of the proletariat. We, stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha, must tell the peoples who are exploited by internal and foreign capital that they must fight against it, while China does not say such a thing. Our party explains to these peoples that they must fight and against whom they must fight, while China does not tell them either that they must fight or against whom they must fight. It calls on them to fight only against Soviet social-imperialism, because it is aiming at world hegemony, and, in other words, is threatening the American hegemony in the world. We tell the peoples how they should organize the fight, who should lead this fight, what are the principles of this fight and what the strategy and fighting tactics of the fight of these peoples should be. Meanwhile, China does not tell the peoples any of these things. On the contrary, it recommends that they pursue a strategy of capital, and should use tactics which serve this capital, which prolong its life, in a word, it tells the peoples to forget the wolf and fight its shadow.

#### An American Agents--A Close Friend of Mao Zedong

Under this title, in the note of Tuesday, May 3, 1977, Comrade Enver Hoxha exposes the role of an agent of the American journalist Edgar Snow in the rapprochement of China with the USA. He writes:

I have read the main book of the American journalist Edgar Snow, the "journalist of the century," as they call him, who has written about China before and after the revolution. But his last book, which in Italian has the title "La Mia Vita di Giornalista" ("My Life as a Journalist"), gives one a better understanding of who this personality is.

This journalist built up a great reputation as a person with profound knowledge of the Chinese question. This is not without foundation. This person has lived a very adventurous life. It is quite obvious from all his writings that Snow must have been an agent of the CIA, if that is what the American intelligence service was called at that time, or a journalist in the service of the American secret police and the Department of State.

In this book, Edgar Snow tells us of his pilgrimage, of how before the Sino-Japanese war, after being sent to the Philippines, to India and Indonesia, he was finally sent to China where he stayed for several years. He got right to Mao Zedong's headquarters, to the caves where the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China established itself after the long march.

Edgar Snow also tells how he won the trust of Mao Zedong.

Edgar Snow's familiarity with Mao Zedong reaches such intimacy that he even mentions trivial events from Mao's daily life.

In order words, Mao Zedong and the other Chinese leaders had complete trust in Edgar Snow. Mao Zedong informed this American about all his political plans, all his ideological views, and even his military plans.



Reading all these things, one cannot fail to think that the views of Mao Zedong and his comrades were pro-American, that they had great admiration for the United States of America and that the "journalist" Edgar Snow managed to play an important role in the rapprochement of China with the United States of America, in the preparations for Kissinger's visit to China, followed by those of Nixon and, later still, Ford.

In the note of Thursday, May 5, 1977, Comrade Enver Hoxha once more speaks of the role of Edgar Snow. Edgar Snow, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, presents China and the new Chinese regime of Mao Zedong as not a very radical regime. According to him, if the United States of America changes its policy towards China, this regime could quite easily develop a policy of friendship with the United States. This policy, according to Edgar Snow, has great importance because of the extent of the territory of China, its big population, its great underground riches, and the influence which this country will exert in Asia and in the world.

[AU060930 0900 GMT 3 Nov 79 AU]

["'Reflections on China'--Extracts From the Political Diary by Comrade Enver Hoxha Leafing the Pages of the Second Volume"--ATA headline; Part Eight. See JPRS 73890 of 24 July 1979, No 1701 and JPRS 74000 of 13 Aug 79 No 1707 of the EAST EUROPE REPORT on Extracts from Volume I.]

[Text] Tirana, November 3, ATA--In the note of Sunday, May 15, 1977, Comrade Enver Hoxha provides other facts showing that the Chinese leadership is sinking deeper into the filth of opportunism and servility towards imperialism. The note is entitled:

#### Chinese Servility Towards America

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes in it: After the London meeting of the major imperialist economic powers with the United States of America, the newspaper PRAVDA wrote an article against the decisions taken at that meeting. The aim of this article is evident: Moscow is not in agreement with the decisions which were taken in London, therefore, in the article it fights, criticizes, and exposes them in its own way and in its own interests. It is truly scandalous that Moscow's article was immediately replied to by RENMIN RIBAO of Peking, which with utter shamelessness, comes to the defence of the "great successes" and the "advantages of the unity" of these capitalist states and defends the "unity" and progress of "United Europe," describing this as a "great success" which is in opposition to the hegemonic ambitions of the Soviet revisionists.

Day by day the Chinese are sinking deeper into the mire, the filth of opportunism without feeling the slightest shame about what world opinion, the Marxist-Leninists and the revolutionaries think of them. They defend

every action of American imperialism and the bourgeois-capitalist states like the dirtiest lackeys they are, and everything done by these big aggressive imperialist powers, which are oppressing the peoples, China applauds. It seems to me that servility towards American imperialism, that imperialism which is supplying China with credits to strengthen itself, can go no further. All this present policy of China, stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha, has a clear aim: To gain time in order to arm itself and become a capitalist great power, that is, to occupy the same positions as the other two superpowers and be ranked along with them.

As for the revolution, it has been put off till the millennium.

#### Hua Guofeng, Also, Kneeling Before Tito

In continuation of his notes Comrade Enver Hoxha extensively writes about the open rapprochement of the Chinese revisionist leadership with, its opportunist stand towards the Yugoslav revisionists. He dwells among others on Tito's visit to China.

In a note dated Durres, Sunday, June 26, 1977, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

They are waiting impatiently for Tito to go to China although among the diplomatic corps there is hardly any talk about his visit, or as one ambassador told Behar: "I tell you, between ourselves, it is China that is going to Tito and not Tito to China." Why this silence among the diplomatic corps about the visit of Tito to China? The explanation could be that the Westerners do not want this visit to be propagated at present, because it is not in favour of China. They do not want China to be completely exposed because Tito's visit, naturally, tears off the mask of China as an allegedly socialist country. The capitalist countries want to preserve its disguise, while the Chinese themselves have cast off all disguise, therefore they are awaiting Tito impatiently, and, as they say, will give him a majestic welcome.

But, of course, Tito is not going there without laying down prior conditions, either, and his going to China will be a crowning success at the end of his life, giving the impression that China, too, has fallen on its knees to him.

On Tuesday, August 30, 1977, analysing the speeches held by Hua Guofeng and Tito in the dinner given in honour of Tito, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

From the speech which Hua Guofeng delivered, it is clear that he is trying to sit on two stools, proclaiming himself with both the "third world" and the "non-aligned world." This has a definite aim. Hua hopes that after the death of Tito, China will lump together Tito's pseudo-world of the "non-aligned" and the "third world," bring about their unification and be the sole leader of these two so-called worlds which, in reality, are the same thing.

I have written somewhere in one of my notes that at present Tito's pseudo-theory of "non-alignment" is to the advantage of American imperialism and the Soviets, because it puts itself in the service of neo-colonialism. Tito who defends such a theory does not deny the contradictions that exist between states, nor those between "non-aligned" states and the imperialist and other capitalist powers. But Tito does not assert this, because he does not want to defend such an evident and important thesis of Marxism-Leninism which no force in the world can oppose. With the term "non-aligned countries," Tito is superior to Mao Zedong who had divided the world in three because, as I stressed at the 7th congress of the party, and as is brought out in the article, "The Theory and Practice of the Revolution," and in all my writings, the "third world" of Mao Zedong eliminates the four main contradictions of our epoch. Hence, from this point of view, the "world" of Mao Zedong and Hua Guofeng is inferior to Tito's "non-aligned world."

In dividing the world in three, Mao Zedong and Hua Guofeng have their own aims. They wipe out the contradictions and preach alliances amongst these "three worlds" in order to fight Soviet social-imperialism, which according to them, is the only aggressive superpower. The Chinese have said that the Soviet Union is still unexposed as an imperialist, or social-imperialist revisionist state. Therefore, the Chinese, while considering themselves genuine Marxist-Leninists with this theory, while fighting social-imperialism as the main danger, want to continue the ideological exposure of it with their anti-Marxist Chinese ideology, so that they become the banner-bearers, are considered to be the main Marxist-Leninist leaders who allegedly defeated one superpower--the Soviet Union--and after they have gathered strength from every possible source, will then turn on the other superpower--American imperialism. When? In the sweet by and by. Thus, the Chinese will "regulate" the situation in the world in peaceful ways without wars, without classes, without the exploitation of man by man. In fact, all this is a fable, which some people believe at present, but which, day by day, will be shown to be a lie. I say a lie, and not utopia, as the revisionist Carrillo says about his "socialist" views when he says that, if Marx, in his time, had heard of these views, he would have said that these were utopian.

Analysing the talks Tito had with Hua Guofeng and other Chinese leaders, Comrade Enver Hoxha argues in a convincing way the slide of the Chinese into revisionism and their kneeling before Tito. Comrade Enver Hoxha makes an analogy between the kneeling of Khrushchev before Tito 14 years ago and Hua Guofeng's. In this note of Sunday, September 4, 1977, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

Tito, Hua Guofeng, Deng Xiaoping and others have ended their political talks in Peking. The TANJUG Agency speaks in detail about all the successes which were achieved in the talks.

According to what we hear and read, their agreement is complete on state relations, economic relations, political relations and cultural relations. Party relations have been established, also, because now in the final

communiqués which XINHUA is transmitting, Tito's title in the party is given first, "Chairman of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia" and the "President of the Federal Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia." This means that the Hua Guofeng's have recognized it as a communist and have made common cause with the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. The thesis of our party that China is now a country headed by a revisionist party, in the leadership of which are renegades from Marxism-Leninism, has been confirmed.

The Chinese leaders are very bad, very hypocritical, they are branded revisionists. Thus the things we said fourteen years ago against Khrushchev, in the articles, "The Results of Khrushchev's Visit to Yugoslavia" or the articles "Khrushchev Kneeling Before Tito," have been confirmed point by point in China, too. Hua Guofeng fell on his knees before Tito and everything which was written in that article fourteen years ago has been confirmed tale quale (exactly--Italian in original) in Peking, too, even down to the failure to publish a communiqué. They did not issue a communiqué because they had reasons not to issue it. However, the correspondents of TANJUG, with great skill and clarity, stressed the achievements, one by one, and in every branch, from the economy down to policy, from the "non-aligned world," which the Chinese adopted, to the recognition of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and Tito as its chairman, of course. China had recognized the League of Communists of Yugoslavia earlier but now it has recognized officially that "socialism is being built in Yugoslavia."

We sought to prove this whole slide of the Chinese into revisions, but they have confirmed it themselves in the talks which they held with Tito. All the Marxist-Leninists in the world, all progressives, will see that China has altered its ideological and political line, will see that it has lined up with the anti-Marxists, with the agents of American imperialism, and is pursuing a pro-American policy, that is, is relying on the United States of America to combat the Soviet Union and to incite a world war.

Writing about the process of degeneration in China, Comrade Enver Hoxha stresses among others in the note of Thursday, December 22, 1977:

What we foresaw in connection with the state relations of China with the Yugoslav state and the relations of the Communist Party of China with the League of Communists of Yugoslavia is being confirmed and coming to pass.

After Tito's visit to Peking, after his welcome with such ado, such pomp, and such affection by Hua Guofeng, Deng Xiaoping and the other Chinese leaders, we see that the agreements reached in secret in the Chinese palaces are being put into practice. The friendship between the Chinese and Yugoslav revisionists is becoming ever more pronounced, not only in words, but also in deeds. Scores of delegations from the party, the trade unions, and the women's organization, economic and especially organizational delegations are going from China to Yugoslavia in order to gain the Yugoslav experience in all these fields. These contacts, these links, this exchanging, or better, this taking of the Yugoslav revisionist experience by the Chinese, is no



longer being done on the quiet, in secret and disguised ways, but is taking place in the full light of the sun.

We learn that these delegations are seeking to gain the experience of Yugoslav "self-administration." The Chinese began this capitalist form of administration long ago, but now they want to perfect it and have thought that the only way to construct this method of capitalist exploitation of workers better is by taking the experience of the Yugoslavs. The Chinese revisionists are not confining themselves to taking experience only in the "self-administration" of the economy in the field of industry and in the big Yugoslav enterprises, which have been constructed with foreign technology from the Americans, West Germans, etc., and are under joint ownership with big foreign capitalist companies, but are going to Yugoslavia also to take the example of the Yugoslav state farms which have been organized according to the model of capitalist agricultural economies.

Apart from this, in ideology, the Communist Party of China will pursue the course of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia with determination, that is, alliance with all the other revisionist parties of the West and other continents of the world. China itself is anxious to do this, because, in order to achieve its strategic aim, it will try to preserve its pseudo-communist disguise and will link this pseudo-communist disguise with the disguises maintained by the other parties which have betrayed Marxism-Leninism and are making great efforts to infiltrate into the capitalist clan, to collaborate with local and international capital to the detriment of the proletariat of the capitalist countries of the world.

The Process of the Degeneration of China  
Continues. An Article Which Exposes a Great  
Intrigue to the Detriment of the Peoples

This is the title of the note dated: Durres, Thursday, July 7, 1977 in which Comrade Enver Hoxha speaks about the importance of the article: "The Theory and Practice of the Revolution" which came out on the same day in the newspaper ZERI I POPULLIT. He writes:

I believe that our article, "The Theory and Practice of the Revolution," which came out today in the newspaper ZERI I POPULLIT, will have a great impact on the Marxist-Leninists abroad and also on other progressive bourgeois thinkers, while the Chinese and their hangers-on, against whom the article is aimed in fact, will certainly be furious. It was necessary, indeed very necessary and essential, that we should prepare and publish this article, because the Chinese revisionists were doing increasing harm, stepping up the struggle against Marxism-Leninism and especially against the Party of Labour of Albania.

As I have said another time, this struggle has been waged in a furtive, cunning, hypocritical way and was entirely unprincipled. The Chinese did not make the slightest effort to defend their notorious theses about the

revolution, because in fact there was no way in which they could defend them, because the division into three worlds and the inclusion of China in the "third world," is nothing but an effort to extinguish the proletarian revolution and make the proletariat submit to the yoke of the capitalist bourgeoisie of the industrialized countries and of American imperialism. This absurd anti-Marxist theory allegedly combated Soviet social-imperialism which was endangering American imperialism, Chinese social-imperialism and the developed capitalist countries. The Chinese theories, which have their source in the bourgeois-revisionist views of Mao Zedong, Zhou Enlai, Deng Xiaoping and Chairman Hua, take no account at all of the peoples and the revolution.

The defence of American imperialism and the other imperialists of Europe and Asia by the Chinese has a major aim which the Chinese are putting into application. Now they are speaking openly about getting aid and credits from these states and capitalist firms in order to strengthen their economy and their army, in other words to make China, too, a superpower, with their assistance, of course, in order to set it on to Soviet social-imperialism.

In this great intrigue which is being hatched up at the expense of the peoples and is disguised with a pseudo-Marxist-Leninist theory, the Chinese revisionist leaders reckon that American imperialism together with Chinese social-imperialism which is building, will go into a third world war to liquidate the other superpower, the Soviet Union.

In the note dated: Pogradec, Wednesday, August 3, 1977, Comrade Enver Hoxha dwells on the echo of the article "The Theory and Practice of the Revolution." He writes among others:

Nearly a month has passed since the day our article "The Theory and Practice of the Revolution" was published and its echo is still very powerful. Now not only is it being given by all the news agencies of the world and commented on by various circles, but it is being dealt with extensively by major world newspapers and the comments are in our favour.

#### Articles With Stale "Theorizing"

Under this title, in the note dated Durres, Monday, August 15, 1977, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: I have been reading four or five Chinese articles which, taken together, make up a single article entitled, "The Division Into Three Worlds by Chairman Mao Is a Marxist-Leninist Definition." This series is allegedly intended for the units of the army, but in fact, it is the only allegedly theoretical article which the "great" Communist Party of China is publishing about the theory of "three worlds" and is a reply to the ZERI I POPULLIT article, "The Theory and Practice of the Revolution." It is truly an article to be derided and laughed at, because, in this expose or analysis, if we can describe it as such, there is absolutely no ideological argument, nothing but a line-up of some general political statements. According to Mao, the "third," is allegedly the main motive force of the

world in the struggle against imperialism, hence it is for the revolution and socialism. Thus, these "theoreticians" with a few soap bubbles want to wipe out the whole Marxist-Leninist theory, want to reject the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin as "outdated dogmas."

Of course, underlines Comrade Enver Hoxha, this article is not written merely to convince the units of soldiers, as is claimed, but is intended for the whole Communist Party of China. This article is published also for those parties of revisionist and Trotskyite hangers-on that call themselves Marxist-Leninist.

It is hard to know whether one should weep or laugh over this material, which is entirely lacking in scientific basis, which not only does not make the slightest dent in our Marxist-Leninist article, which is unassailable like a granite fortress, but by contrast, raises the prestige of our party even higher, raises even higher the Marxist-Leninist thought of our party, which really makes sound analyses of international situations, the social situation, of the struggle, the revolution and its motive forces, and all the means which are used to achieve these objectives.

It is clear to us that the Communist Party of China, on its present anti-Marxist course, is bound to commit further asininites of this type and sink more deeply into the revisionist mire.

#### The Main Ideas of the 11th Congress of the Communist Party of China

In the note of Sunday, August 21, 1977, Comrade Enver Hoxha dwells on the proceedings of the 11th congress of the Communist Party of China. Among others he dwells also on the content of the political speech delivered by Hua Guofeng at this congress. Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: In regard to foreign policy, he declared that China would not budge in the slightest from its stands, that the Chinese are allegedly against the two superpowers which want war, and especially against the Soviet Union which is the more ferocious. Hence, the prospect is of the orientation of China towards the United States of America.

He indulged in great demagoguery about China's support for the "third world." This was the last question dealt with, but he explained it earlier, saying that China would assist all the peoples who are seeking liberation, etc., etc., and which are led by the proletariat. Thus, this is how the China of Hua Guofeng explains the "third world," and further on he stresses that he defends the "famous" theory of Mao Zedong.

Just by chance, I read in a French encyclopedia that Roosevelt mentioned the term "third world" as early as 1945 and declared that the United States of America ought to assist the countries of that world. For their part, however, the Chinese claim that Mao Zedong invented this theory in 1974. But this is of no great importance. The important thing is that the Chinese explain

nothing in this direction and there is no way they can explain it, because the line of the Communist Party of China and its congress is not Marxist-Leninist. Only this can explain everything correctly, stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha.

[AU061018 0900 GMT 4 Nov 79 AU]

["'Reflections on China'--Extracts From the Political Diary by Comrade Enver Hoxha Leafing the Pages of the Second Volume"--ATA headline; Part Nine. See JPRS 73890 of 24 July 1979, No 1701 and JPRS 74000 of 13 Aug 79 No 1707 of the EAST EUROPE REPORT on Extracts From Volume I.]

[Text] Tirana, November 4, ATA--In the note of Saturday, August 27, 1977, analysing the talks the Chinese leaders conducted with Cyrus Vance, secretary of the State Department of the United States of America, during his visit to China, Comrade Enver Hoxha exposes the aims of the Chinese leadership which, thanks to the alliance with U.S. imperialism leaves Taiwan in the claws of the U.S. The note is entitled:

#### Taiwan Is Forgotten

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: This time the question of Taiwan was not mentioned, apart from what Hua Guofeng said at the 11th congress. But these oft-repeated phrases we have long known by heart. We also know that they have violated the conditions they themselves have set for the establishment of diplomatic links with all the states of the world. Hence, the question of Taiwan proved no barrier to the establishment of close, friendly, commercial, cultural and possibly even military relations with the United States of America. We must not be surprised if there are secret agreements between them, not only over Taiwan, but also over other questions.

In this situation, and with these views, which China has, it is in its interest for Taiwan to remain under the existing status quo and for the American forces to remain there, to remain in Japan, and everywhere else they are stationed, because China needs them. There is no doubt that China is in alliance with the United States of America. Our theses have been and still are correct, life has confirmed them. China is relying on one ferocious imperialism to fight another imperialism. It is doing this, not to serve the revolution, but in order to become a superpower itself, another social-imperialist power. All the ambitions of China are directed to this end, and this is also the aim of the Sino-American agreement which has been established and will grow stronger.

#### The Chinese, too, Will Try To Maintain Their "Marxist" Disguise

Under this title, Comrade Enver Hoxha exposes, in another note of Tuesday, August 30, 1977, the aims of the Chinese revisionists to create a new revisionist grouping under their leadership.



China stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha with its theory of the "third world," Tito with his theory of the "non-aligned world," and Carrillo and company with "Eurocommunism" have marked tendencies towards an alleged re-examination of the analysis of the situation in the world. They want to form another revisionist ideological bloc, separate from Soviet modern revisions. As to Marxism-Leninism, this does not come into the question at all, and is disregarded by both the new revisionist bloc and the old Soviet bloc. The Communist Party of China is aiming to create a new grouping under its leadership, just as Soviet modern revisionism has created its own grouping which it is trying to keep together.

All this stagnation, all this confusion, is created to prolong the existence of capital and to combat the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. In other words, the revisionists are striving in various ways to ensure that the communist parties, the world proletariat and the proletariat of each country abandon the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, abandon the true science of the revolution, of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the class struggle, which lead to socialism.

This is the aim of all these anti-Marxist groupings that call themselves communist, from Titoism, Khrushcheviteism, "Eurocommunism" down to Chinese revisionism. A name may even be found for the "communism" of Asia which corresponds to "Eurocommunism." But the Chinese are not satisfied with finding a name suitable for Asiatic "communism." They want to put themselves forward as the leaders of world Marxism-Leninism. But this disguise has become tattered and will certainly become even more so, although, like the Soviets, they will make every possible effort to patch up their disguise with "Marxist" paint for as long as possible.

On the Capital Questions of Marxism-Leninism  
The Chinese Leaders are Out-and-Out Revisionists

This is the title of the note of Thursday, September 1, 1977, in which Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

The Chinese view which defends the European Common Market and "United Europe" is very clearly revisionist, because the European Common Market is nothing but a form of the export of public (no longer private) capital in the framework of neo-colonialism and the feature of this organization is the development of different imperialist integrations. According to the Chinese theory, state monopoly capital is a transformation within the highest stage of imperialism which gives the state the possibility to control the private capitalist monopolies or the private trusts and concerns to some extent.

It is known that the revisionist theory about state monopoly capital is not in any way a continuation of the theory of Marxism-Leninism; on the contrary, it is a deviation from the Marxist-Leninist theory. Lenin touched on this matter only in passing, at the time of the Great October Socialist Revolution, in 1917, while Stalin does not mention it at all. The revisionist theory about state monopoly capital has been developed especially since the Second World War.

The revisionists have never been able to apply their theory about state monopoly capital. They have merely made a summary of the new means of intervention which the state possesses at a particular stage of economic development, which comprise the economic weapon of the new-type capitalism, and say that this weapon gives the democratic and revolutionary forces the possibility to turn this market of the state monopoly capital against the monopolies by taking the state under their control. But this is only a dream.

Hence, the Chinese, like all the other revisionists, especially the Western ones, who vigorously support the view that "United Europe" must be a strong union and that the European Common Market must be strengthened, make no effort to explain this question thoroughly, because they have no arguments, do not have the theoretical possibilities, therefore they have avoided trying to explain it theoretically. They have defined their aim merely in the explanation which they make, that such a grouping in a "United Europe" and the strengthening of the European Common Market will withstand the imminent attack of American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. With this they are telling the proletarians to forget the contradictions which exist between them and capital: they are telling them to allow the capitalist state to assist the monopolies and the private interests of capital: not to rise in revolt, not to draw revolutionary, theoretical and practical conclusions from the grave and continuous crisis of monopoly capital. They are telling them not to take measures to fight unemployment, starvation and social oppression inflicted on them by world monopoly capital and local capital in close alliance with each other.

Hence, stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha, the Chinese are acting as out-and-out revisionist on this capital question of our Marxist-Leninist theory and the practice of the revolution.

The renegades from Marxism-Leninism have always striven to divide state monopoly capitalism from imperialism as a separate phase with entirely new features, even presenting it as "state socialism." The Chinese revisionists, too, accept the revisionist theses that state monopoly capitalism is a separate phase and, moreover, proclaim it as an essential phase which every country must go through before socialism is achieved. In other words, like the other modern revisionists, they are seeking to prolong the existence of capitalism, while they tell the proletariat and the peoples that they must wait until this essential phase has been achieved and that when this has come about, the road to socialism does not go through the proletarian revolution, but this transition should be made with peaceful parliamentary means, by reaching agreement with other parties, that is, they advocate pluralism, in total opposition to the teaching of Lenin who said that only by means of the revolution and "...in revolution state monopoly capitalism passes directly into socialism." The Chinese do not state this frankly, but their theses of the unity and alliance of the "third world" with the "second world," eliminating the differences with the formerly powerful capitalist countries and imperialist countries, and of the alliance of these two worlds with

American imperialism against Soviet social-imperialism, shows nothing but the Trotskyite course which the Chinese revisionist leaders have taken.

The links which China is creating with the world capitalist economy constitute a support which it is giving neo-colonialism and the development of world monopoly finance capital. China supports the export of foreign capital and tries to profit from it.

Therefore, the Chinese question is by no means simple. With their great-state megalomania, the Chinese think that others can be sucked in by them, can be deceived by their magogy, but the disguise they have adopted is very clumsy. Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: The Chinese with their theory of "three worlds," not only do not advocate revolutionary movement, the general strike movement of a political and economic character against the ruling capitalist powers, but call on the proletariat of these countries and the oppressed masses to unite with everybody, hence to become one even with their bourgeois-capitalist leaders.

**The Clique of Hua Guofeng Is an Anti-Marxist Gang, a Gang of Capitalists**

In the note of Thursday, September 8, 1977, Comrade Enver Hoxha points out some conclusions he has drawn about the line of the Chinese revisionists, conclusions which have been and are being confirmed by time. This is clearly seen in the efforts of the U.S. and other imperialists to make China fall into their imperialist lap. He writes:

In my notes I have written from time to time about many questions, some of them in harsh terms. This I have done because my communist consciousness. The experience of the party, and study of the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism did not allow me to use gentler terms in the face of many confused and dubious situations. We have been in open opposition to the Chinese comrades over political matters of first-rate importance, especially over the question of Stalin, whom we defended, while they criticized him harshly, and over the question of the class struggle, which they claimed that we did not wage properly and they carried out "well," whereas, in fact, the reality spoke and speaks of the complete opposite.

We have struggled over all these contradictions which we have had, as well as over the contradictions in regard to the stands towards the Soviets in which the Chinese have shown extreme vacillations at various stages, from Bucharest on. The Chinese leaders, not only Liu Shaoqi, but also Mao Zedong, Zhou Enlai and Li Xiannian with the exception of Kang Sheng, were in favour of ceasing the polemics with the Soviets.

The Chinese did not agree with our views, and were not convinced of what we told them. They were not convinced, and I have written about this earlier, because, by ceasing the polemic with the Soviets, they sought to gain time to become a great power. However, the Soviets thought differently. They

thought that China should become a revisionist country which would proceed under their direction and dictate. When the Chinese understood the aims of the Soviets, the split came about, and for a time the polemic was waged between them. This continued while, at the same time, a change was made in the strategy of China, which turned towards the United States of America. This strategy liquidated Lin Biao and the four. The clique in power, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, is an anti-Marxist gang, a gang of capitalists who are proceeding rapidly on the capitalist course, towards rapprochement and collaboration with the United States of America in order to counter-balance Soviet social-imperialism, to become a superpower, a country developed economically and militarily on the capitalist road, and not a great socialist state, as these renegades pretend. Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha points out that American imperialism and the capitalist countries of the world, will now invest capital, create banks and multinational companies in China, so that China falls into their imperialist lap.

Regardless of the temporary defeats we have suffered, we must fight against this situation with the greatest severity, must defend Marxism-Leninism, defend the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, which always remains strong, pure, and triumphant. The peoples and the world proletariat have lost neither their courage nor their hope in victory. They are fighting and will fight harder yet. They will recognize the betrayal of these pseudo-communists more and more clearly each day, and will see that this betrayal makes the yoke of world capital and internal capital even heavier on their backs. Thus, they will come to the conclusion that Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin reached, that the peoples and the proletariat must create those revolutionary situations, must create those Marxist-Leninist parties which will carry out the revolution and seize power in order to build a socialist society, their own society, through a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

#### China's Objectives in Policy and Ideology

In the note of Friday, October 14, 1977 Comrade Enver Hoxha exposes China's aims to become a state with a great economic-military potential receiving credits from the U.S.A. and other capitalist states. The forecasts of Comrade Enver Hoxha have been confirmed by time. In this note Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

Ideologically, the Chinese are united with and in the same positions as all the revisionist currents in the world, to which they will add the specific characteristics of Chinese revisionism, which will emerge because of the terrain of Chinese society itself, the aspirations of the revisionist clique, and the old Chinese philosophy. In other words, Chinese revisions will be a very complicated, mystical and cunning grafting, because the Chinese will steadily advance in the defence of their eclectic revisionist theories.



Apart from this, the policy of China will be characterized also by great and continuing instability. For a long time it will be characterized by hypocrisy, by smiles and blows at the same time, by unprincipled attacks and counter-attacks. The whole trend of this policy will be characterized by efforts to create an atmosphere of confusion in other continents, too, especially in Asia and Africa, where China will try to have its own dominating influence, in other words, to create those markets and spheres of influence which are necessary for it to become a superpower.

The struggle against Chinese revisionism must be waged from this angle. The "great" policy of China will clash directly not only with the resolute struggle of the Party of Labour of Albania and all the other Marxist-Leninist communist and workers parties of the world, but, at the same time, also with the opposition of the peoples of the so-called third world, with whom China thinks it can pursue a two-faced policy of deception, with many flags. It will come into contradiction with one people or the other because contradictions are inherent in revisionism. Likewise, the imperialist aims of China will create contradictions, too, not only between itself and the imperialists, not only between itself and the big industrialized states, that is, other imperialists smaller than the American and Soviet imperialists, but also amongst states and peoples which it calls of the "third world." China is not in a position to define a correct policy because its policy is not Marxist-Leninist, but a pragmatic policy, an eclectic capitalist policy.

China's real aim is to get large credits from the United States of America, first of all, as well as from Japan, West Germany, France, etc., to strengthen its army and its economy. These are the two objectives of China in policy and ideology. There is nothing Marxist-Leninist in this orientation, on the contrary, this is a bourgeois policy and ideology which will turn China into a state with great economic and military potential, but with a capitalist structure and superstructure.

As the days and months go by, the Marxist-Leninists will see this anti-Marxist policy of China even more clearly. The poor peoples of the world, too, who are demanding genuine freedom and independence, want to be liberated from the shackles of capital. They, too, will see and understand more and more clearly each day that the policy of China is just as much an enslaving policy as that of American imperialism or Soviet social-imperialism, and will understand that China is pursuing its policy with the reactionary leaders of those countries, but not with the peoples.

[AU061030 0900 GMT 5 Nov 79 AU]

["'Reflections on China'--Extracts From the Political Diary by Comrade Enver Hoxha Leafing the Pages of the Second Volume"--ATA headline; Part Ten. See JPRS 73890 of 24 July 1979, No 1701 and JPRS 74000 of 13 Aug 79 No 1707 of the EAST EUROPE REPORT on Extracts From Volume I.]

[Text] Tirana, November 5, ATA--The Chinese social-imperialists have become irresistible and have flung away every mask in their warmongering foreign policy. In the note of Monday, October 24, 1977 which is entitled:

### Deng Xiaoping's Interview Is a Fascist Interview

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: Last week Deng Xiaoping gave AFP (the French News Agency) an interview. In general, the aim of the questions was to enable the AFP to see the various views of the Chinese leaders, especially those of Deng Xiaoping, and he openly and bluntly expressed the views of the Chinese Government.

The main problem that he took up was that the world tension against Soviet social-imperialism, which according to the Chinese revisionists, is the main enemy, must be raised even higher. Deng Xiaoping said openly that the whole world must be mobilized and united in a common front to put down the Soviet Union and foil its plans for war. He called on the United States of America and the other big imperialist states to stop supplying technology and other things to the Soviet Union. From Deng's replies, it is clear that China expects major aid from the imperialists. Deng Xiaoping said, "We shall continue the policy of Chairman Mao in the field of foreign policy questions, and precisely the theory of three worlds, which will be the basis of our foreign policy in the future.... I was the first to present this theory in the United Nations organization in 1974."

This Chinese fascist comes into contradiction with the theory of the Chinese leadership and with himself because, after he says that the main and the most dangerous enemy is the Soviet Union, he defends the thesis that the Soviet Union is weak, is short of grain, short of bread, lacks technology, and that it is untrue that the Soviet Union is superior in atomic weapons on extermination, etc. Up till now, a personality who poses as a Marxist-Leninist, but is such a ferocious fascist as to preach bloody imperialist war on a world scale, had never been seen before. This is Deng Xiaoping behind whom stands the clique of the Chinese fascist army and certainly Hua Guofeng, too.

However, in this interview Deng Xiaoping never even mentioned the famous Chairman Hua Guofeng. He spoke as chairman of the party, as premier, as dictator of China, spoke with unlimited authority and with challenging arrogance about his aggressive aims and about open, all-round collaboration with the United States of America and the developed capitalist countries of the world.

In this interview of Deng Xiaoping's neither the word "socialist" nor the terms "socialist country" or "Marxism-Leninism" can be found. They have all disappeared from the vocabulary of this fascist.

Asked what he thought about "Eurocommunism," Deng Xiaoping said that he did not sympathize with those parties because he feared and suspected that they wanted to get into the governments of their countries in order to reduce the

tension with the Soviet Union, whereas he expressed himself openly as against reduction of the tension. He stressed that everything possible should be done to increase the tension, i.e., to increase the psychosis of the new imperialist war. He sees nothing from the class angle, but looks at everything from the angle of the outburst of a bloody atomic war on a world scale.

This was the essence of the interview that Deng Xiaoping gave.

We, continues Comrade Enver Hoxha, try to prove the rapprochement of China with the United States of America and the big capitalist bourgeoisie of the world with facts and documents, but in reality it doesn't require much brain to grasp this, because Deng Xiaoping and his clique themselves speak quite openly not merely of rapprochement but of alliance with the United States of America and with all the world's warmongers. It doesn't worry Deng Xiaoping that the actions he proposes will involve the peoples and the proletariat of all countries in a bloodbath. The peoples' liberation struggle, which is being waged against imperialism, social-imperialism, revisionism of every shade, and the local reactionary bourgeoisie, means nothing to this fascist. Deng Xiaoping and the Chinese ruling clique are opposed to these liberation struggles, therefore they make appeals that these should stop and the peoples should submit to the Chinese fascist dictate.

These are truly the ideas of a maniac inflamed with the scent of blood.

It is not accidental, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha further on, that Deng Xiaoping proclaimed this policy so openly before world opinion. Of course, among world opinion, not only the Marxist-Leninists but also the imperialist big bourgeoisie and even American imperialism, do not accept such a brutal policy and dictate of Deng Xiaoping. They understand what the aims of China are: To get big credits from the imperialist and capitalist countries, to strengthen its army and economy, to become a superpower and counter-balance the power of the two biggest states, the United States of America and the Soviet Union. Of course, the Americans and all the international companies, which are financing China, the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and one another, are not so crazy as to follow the course which Deng Xiaoping advises. There is no doubt that war breaks out when the contradictions are exacerbated to the limit. And these contradictions are truly becoming exacerbated. In the world there are main elements in connection with the outbreak of war, and also investing companies which are like a catalyzer which cannot be neglected in this direction, and it is precisely these multinational companies, these colossal trusts, which dictate the policy of governments. As a conclusion we can say that it is not Deng Xiaoping with all his talk who decides the fate of the world.

An Anti-Marxist Document on the Editorial of  
the Newspaper RENMIN RIBAO about the Division  
Into "Three Worlds"

In the note of Monday, October 31, 1977, Comrade Enver Hoxha argues that the Chinese leaders came out as revisionists, as sworn enemies of Marxism-

leninism, the proletarian revolution and the liberation movements, in defence of the capitalist order, the note reads:

This long, allegedly theoretical article is pseudo-Marxist from start to finish. I shall return again in greater detail to its content and aim, but today I want to point out in advance that this article was written to oppose the theses and main ideas of our 7th congress and the development of these ideas in the different articles we have published.

I think that the Chinese published this article after a very long delay, because first, they had to test the pulse of international communist opinion and world opinion, in general, about the theses of our congress and the further development of them in the articles which we published later. They saw that there was a great world reaction in favour of the theses of our party. The world understood that we were attacking the pseudo-Marxist theses of Mao Zedong's theory of "three worlds" and the advance of China to friendship and alliance with American imperialism. With this article the Chinese want first of all to "prove" Mao Zedong's theory of "three world," to present it as if it were based completely on the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. This new article of RENMIN RIBAO, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, does not speak about the revolution, because for the Chinese, Lenin's theses which say that imperialism is the final phase of capitalism and the ever of the proletarian revolution, are outdated. The proletarian revolution has been eliminated from the Chinese plan because for them, their alliance with the bourgeoisie, world capitalism, American imperialism, has been put in first place. China, continues Comrade Enver Hoxha, is trying to create a unity of various revisionists in the world who, together, will be able to break the "baton of the conductor," Soviet revisionism, which still has influence in the world by posing as the successor to Lenin and which, at present, has the countries of Eastern Europe in bondage. Hence Chinese revisionism is that variant of modern revisionism which aims to bring about the linking of the various forms of revisionism everywhere in the world and to establish its own hegemony. Chinese revisionism is collaborating with imperialism so that socialism will triumph in the "peaceful way," through "democratic" and "parliamentary" forms, without violent revolution, without the hegemony of the proletariat, hence through a social revolution led by many parties, through pluralism.

Having American imperialism beside them, the Chinese revisionists are trying, through deception and pseudo-Marxist slogans, to penetrate ideologically and economically into the countries of the "third world," to establish their hegemony there. Hence, in aiming to become a superpower, China is working, first, to prepare the terrain politically and ideologically and then to act in these countries by pouring in its own capital, when it manages to create this, and later to act with military threats, too, at the United States of America and the Soviet Union are doing today. By studying the international platform of the Communist Party of China, the Party of Labour of Albania, as a Marxist-Leninist party, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, discloses where the anti-Marxist views of this party in this field have their source. In



general, our contradictions with that party stem from the fact that the Communist Party of China is not a Marxist-Leninist party. Since it is not such a party, the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot exist in China and there is no way that socialism can be built. Our party is clear on the general outlines of this problem, but nevertheless, it is its duty to go more deeply into the matter.

#### Again on the Chinese Article Which Speaks About the Theory of "Three Worlds"

In the note of Thursday, November 3, 1977 which appears under the above title, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

This is an anti-Marxist article, because it denies the proletarian revolution and defends imperialism, the bourgeoisie and international reaction. This article preaches the unity of the proletariat with capitalism and it is intended to prepare the terrain for China to become a superpower.

From a careful study of this article it can be seen that the Chinese revisionists are trying to put into the mouth of Mao Zedong certain phrases about the necessity of strengthening the solidarity with the socialist countries, about solidarity with the world proletariat and the oppressed nations, etc. In reality, however, they are acting in a direction entirely the opposite of what they preach, because they are not performing any of these duties towards socialist countries and the world proletariat. On the contrary, their whole policy is intended to split the solidarity of the world proletariat and disrupt the solidarity with the socialist countries. In fact, the Chinese revisionists are not and cannot be for solidarity with the socialist countries since they include them in the "third world."

#### Excessive Zeal of the Chinese to Adopt the Ideas of the Enemies of Marxism-Leninism

According to the Chinese revisionists, the theory of the "three worlds" was invented by Chairman Mao himself. It is a good thing that the Chinese revisionists have defined the parentage of this thesis, because in this their excessive zeal to adopt the ideas of enemies of Marxism-Leninism is apparent. In reality it was not the mind of Mao Zedong which gave birth to the "three worlds." This term was known to the world before the Chinese used it, hence before 1974. The capitalist world, which is opposed to Marx and Lenin, has used the term the "third world" since the Second World War. That along with the big and very big countries there also are other countries which had just been liberated. The Chinese revisionists have copied this product of the capitalist vocabulary--the "third world," which has to do only with the level of economic development of those countries, and they have defined it as a "major motive force," allegedly on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. It cannot be accepted that the theory of the "three worlds" is a "Marxist definition of the contemporary world situation," as the propagandists in Peking stress.

The Chinese opportunists write that Mao Zedong's "theory" about the division into "three worlds" seems, at first sight, as if it has to do only with the contemporary relations between countries and nations. We do not draw conclusions from a "first sight." The relations between countries and nations exist in reality, but we Marxist-Leninists must look at these relations and their perspective from the angle of the interests of the revolution. This is precisely what the Chinese do not do. They oppose their great state interests and the struggle which they are waging for leadership in the "third world" to the revolution. The class struggle must be waged in the countries of this so-called third world, too, but from what angle? We say: From the angle of the interests of the revolution and the overthrow of the exploiting bourgeoisie, of barbaric capitalism, while the Chinese opportunists are for class conciliation.

The Chinese, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, have never fought and are not fighting from the positions of the international proletariat, have not defended and are not defending the interests of the revolutionary peoples. To maintain relations with reaction and the most bloodthirsty fascists such as Pinochet, Strauss, the shah of Iran and Mobutu, who are the most notorious executioners of the peoples, means to totally disregard the interests of the international proletariat and the interests of the proletariat of a particular country, which coincide with those of the international proletariat.

#### Chinese Revisionists Are Distorters of Leninism

Any political and economic analysis which can be made of the world on the basis of the Leninist theory, underlines Comrade Enver Hoxha, must highlight the fundamental characteristic of its division into capitalist and socialist, otherwise the analysis cannot be Leninist. This analysis is in no way in opposition to and does not negate the fact that there are exploiting and exploited nations in the world.

However, to quote Lenin in order to prove on the basis of his ideas that the world is allegedly divided into three is a thing which only distorters of Leninism could do. And in this fictitious division of the world, the distorters of Leninism are the Chinese revisionists. In order to study and analyse the complicated processes correctly, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, the most important contradiction must be discovered, that is, the fundamental contradiction which determines the development of all other contradictions and on the resolution of which the resolution of all the other contradictions depends. We have not forgotten, but resolutely uphold the laws of dialectics. The Chinese revisionists want to dodge materialist dialectics and to disguise themselves with many quotations taken at random from the classics of Marxism-Leninism, which they separate and combine in this article in such a way that not only can they not be understood correctly, but their correct meaning is distorted to the opposite of what their authors stated very clearly. All the Marxist-Leninists of the world recognize the fact that, for the definition of the present epoch, all the principal contradictions must be analysed as a whole in order to define the fundamental

contradiction. It is precisely the Chinese who avoid this realistic examination of the division of the political forces in the world. The division of the world into "first," "second" and "third" worlds, as the Chinese do, means to cover up the contradictions, to disregard one or the other major social contradiction and to fail to analyse them as a whole.

Our classics saw every national movement and the different political forces from the angle of the interests of the international proletariat. They have taught us that the revolution can triumph at the weakest link of world capitalism. Our great teachers also teach us that the independence of one people, won through revolution, assists the liberation of other peoples, too, whether in Europe, Asia, or in other parts of the world. The Chinese revisionists do not proceed from these Marxist views. On the contrary, they see the national movements and the different political forces from the angle of their interests of becoming a superpower, therefore they have assisted and are assisting, not the peoples struggles for independence, but the reactionary cliques who are ruling these peoples. That is why the Chinese preach to the proletariat social peace and collaboration with the bourgeoisie.

With the aim of proving their thesis that "Soviet social-imperialism has become the main enemy of the peoples of the world, that it is the centre of world reaction which is threatening the world with a war," the Chinese revisionists refer to Marx and Engels, in their article, citing the ideas expressed by them in 1848 about the danger of czarism. However, the very correct ideas of Marx against czarism in no way prove what the Chinese now want to prove, that Soviet social-imperialism alone is the main enemy of the peoples of the world. Proceeding from a Marxist-Leninist analysis, we insist that besides Soviet social-imperialism, American imperialism, together with all world reaction, are enemies of the peoples. All these enemies, in unity and in contradiction with one another, are at war with the world proletariat in general and with the proletariat of each particular country. They are all at war with the peoples who are demanding national and social liberation, therefore the proletariat and the peoples must be linked in steel unity in order to fight the dangerous enemies they are facing. From the study of Marx, it turns out that in order to achieve its aspirations, the proletariat, in the course of waging the class struggle on an international scale, must never unite with this black international reaction. It is not sufficient merely to "hail" the revolutionary drive of the peoples in the struggle for liberation, as the Chinese revisionists do, but we must know how to guide this drive in the best possible way, according to the teachings of our four great classics—Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin (and not according to the idealist and eclectic ideas of Mao Zedong)—who have clearly defined for us what must be done in order to achieve the liberation of the peoples from the yoke of capital.

Then Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: At the 2nd congress of the communist international, Lenin delivered the report on the international situation and the fundamental tasks of this international. Analysing the aims of the imperialist war and presenting the situation of the world after this war,

he says that a part of the population of the world lives in the colonial countries, a part in the countries which managed to preserve the old situation, and finally mentions the peoples of a few countries that gained from the division of the world. This balance of the consequences of the imperialist war made by Lenin in July 1920 is completely correct, but cannot serve in any way to support the Chinese opportunist thesis of "three worlds" or "three groups," as they say, when our party rejects the anti-Marxist Chinese theory of "three worlds." It is guided entirely by the teachings of Lenin and also bears in mind Lenin's report to the 2nd congress of the Communist International. However the Chinese revisionists quote this Marxist analysis of Lenin's in order to create the illusion that his idea about the causes of the imperialist war and its consequences for the peoples of the world is allegedly the same as Mao Zedong's idea of "three worlds" and, as a conclusion, that the alliance of the proletariat with the oppressed people against the reactionary bourgeoisie that Lenin advocated, are identical with the alliances which Mao Zedong advocates. If it were true that Lenin, at the 2nd congress of the COMINTERN, wanted to imply that the world was divided in three parts, a thing which suits the desire of the Chinese revisionists, he would not have declared a year later, in December 1921 at the 9th All-Union Congress of Soviets of Russia: "Now there are two worlds," but would have spoken of three worlds.

Lenin did not say, either in 1920, or earlier, or later, that the proletariat should unite with American or with British imperialism. On the contrary, he stressed the fundamental contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and showed the way to the liberation of the proletariat through the proletarian revolution and the liberation of the oppressed peoples through national liberation wars. The theory of "three worlds" however, ignores these teachings of Lenin's and does not put forward any tasks for the revolution. The genuine Marxists, underlines Comrade Enver Hoxha, confront their actions with the ideas of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, while the renegades attempt to impose their adverse actions on the classics by means of mutilated quotations, arbitrary interpretations, falsifications, etc.

This is what the Chinese revisionists have done with the large number of quotations which they have presented in their article. And they have done this because they are unable to prove their opportunist theses. Let us take an example just for illustration. Speaking about the character of the different national movements, in his work, "On the Foundations of Leninism," Stalin arrives at the conclusion that the revolutionary or reactionary character of a national movement must be judged from the fact of whether objectively its direction is to smash and get rid of imperialism, or to consolidate the triumph of imperialism.

"Objectively," says Stalin, "the struggle of the emir of Afghanistan for the independence of Afghanistan, is a revolutionary struggle...." (J.V. Stalin, "Works," vol 6, pp 146-147 (ALB. Ed.).)



Stalin is correct, because the emir he referred to decimated the British armies in the passes of the Pamirs. Of all the great army of the British occupiers only three people, including a doctor, managed to struggle back to India. The Chinese revisionists absolutize this example from Stalin, who correctly refers to a concrete historical incident, in order to arrive at the conclusion that they allegedly have the authorization of Stalin to assist and support all the reactionary monarchs and princes of the world, right down to Mobutu who is nothing but an agent of American imperialism, a "modern" oppressor of the Congolese people.

In order to justify the alliance which they advocate today between the proletariat and the oppressed peoples on the one hand, and American imperialism and the other imperialisms on the other hand, against Soviet social-imperialism, the Chinese revisionists do not fail to bring up as an "argument" the great anti-fascist alliance between the Soviet Union and the Anglo-Americans against Hitlerite Germany in the Second World War. This Chinese style of reasoning is so absurd that it can only serve to expose its authors. Historical facts and events must be conceived in close connection with the conditions and circumstances of their own time.

Why Was the Article of RENMIN RIBAO on the  
Division Into "Three Worlds" Written and  
Whom Does It Serve?

When one reads this "major" article of the Chinese about the theory of "three worlds," writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, the question arises in everyone's mind: Why was it written and whom does it serve? Thinking this over, one immediately comes to the conclusion that this article is aimed against the revolutionary theses of the 7th congress of our party, as well as against the ZERI I POPULLIT article of July 7 this year, entitled "The Theory and Practice of the Revolution" and other articles which we have published. Our theses are correct, militant, Marxist-Leninist, and their purpose is to explain the international situation and the revolutionary processes which characterize it correctly, in order to arm the Albanian communists and all those people who read and study them. These theses of our party to combat imperialism, whether American or Soviet, as well as other imperialisms and world reaction, assist the struggle for the revolution, help to raise the peoples in national liberation struggle against capitalism within the country and on an international scale. These are the aims of the theses which we have put forward. The aim of the Chinese revisionists in publishing their article, on the contrary is very bad, because it ignores the main issue, that of the struggle which all the peoples of the world must wage against their main enemies. In the Chinese article one does not see a single revolutionary task put forward, one does not see the main revolutionary task, the national liberation struggle of the peoples against their capitalist oppressors, does not see the interests of the world revolution or the interests of a particular country at the weak of world imperialism.

The words "revolution" and "national liberation struggle" cannot be found anywhere in this article. Hence, this article has not been written with the aim of arousing the peoples, of educating them and showing them the road of the struggle. Then what does this article of the Chinese tell the proletariat and the peoples? It is clear that its main aim is to demonstrate that Mao Zedong's theory of "three worlds" is allegedly a correct Marxist-Leninist theory merely to serve their anti-Marxist cause. This is the main purpose for which this article was written.

Its other aim is to fight us and quell the revolution, to quell the national liberation struggle and advocate the alliance of the proletariat and the oppressed peoples with the reactionary bourgeoisie, American imperialism, British, French, Japanese and other imperialisms.

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes further on:

The thesis on the hegemonic role of the peasantry in the revolution is anti-Marxist and revisionist. And so is the "advice," the only "advice," anti-Marxist and revisionist from start to finish, that China bothers to give the world proletariat, and especially the European proletariat, that it must first learn Marxism-Leninism and then hurl itself into the revolution. This is the same as the "theory of cadres" of Anastas Lulo and Andrea Zisi, according to which, first the cadres must be trained and then one can proceed to the formation of the party and the revolution. In a word, according to Deng Xiaoping, we have a period of twenty years, in which we should allow American imperialism and the reactionary bourgeoisie to strengthen themselves in every country of the world and then see what we should do after that. His old master, the revisionist Liu Shaoqi, did the same thing, when in 1949 he advocated that China should not undertake the construction of socialism, but should continue on the old course it had inherited, should allow the Chinese bourgeoisie and the kulaks to run China for a full thirty years after its liberation and during this time "the proletariat would gain the experience to act."

Hence, it is clear that the aims of the theses of this pseudo Marxist Chinese article do not serve the revolution and national liberation struggles, but render very good service to imperialism, world reaction and China, which has not set out on the capitalist road and is preparing to turn into a social-imperialist world superpower.

The whole RENMIN RIBAO article about the "three worlds" has no theoretical value at all, has no tinge of Marxism-Leninism. It is anti-Marxist, revisionist from start to finish. No truth and no revolutionary aim can be found in it. Everything in this article is in the service of the counterrevolutionary cause of protecting the imperialist powers and maintaining the status quo of capitalism in the world. The aim of maintaining this status quo is that during this time China should arm itself with most modern means and receive aid to strengthen its war economy.

The Chinese leaders think that this article will make an impact on the peoples and the communists of the world, but they are wrong. And in fact we see that such a thing has not occurred amongst world opinion over this RENMIN RIBAO article. We saw only two or three reports and comments about the Chinese article from the main news agencies which pointed out that China attacks the Soviet Union in an editorial article. Meanwhile, in regard to the ZERI I POPULLIT article of July 7, there was talk all around the world and not just for weeks but for months on end, and it is still being discussed and commented on positively.

[AU061230 0900 GMT 6 Nov 79 AU]

["'Reflections on China'--Extracts From the Political Diary by Comrade Enver Hoxha Leafing the Pages of the Second Volume"--ATA headline; Part Eleven. See JPRS 73890 of 24 July 1979, No 1701 and JPRS 74000 of 13 Aug 79 No 1707 of the EAST EUROPE REPORT on Extracts From Volume I.]

[Text] Tirana, November 6, ATA--In continuation of other notes Comrade Enver Hoxha warns that we shall witness a new turn of the Chinese revisionists towards their rapprochement with Soviet social-imperialism in the future. In fact, of late, Chinese social-imperialism has commenced governmental talks with Soviet social-imperialism and has begun the policy of counter-balance with the other two superpowers, a policy this which, as early as 1977, has been described by Comrade Enver Hoxha as a "three-handed game." In the note of Monday, November 7, 1977 entitled:

#### A Three-Handed Game

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: Yesterday I read the message of congratulations sent by the Chinese leaders to the Soviet leaders on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution in which the first signs of the softening in the relations between the leaders of these two countries are apparent. After speaking about the importance of the revolution, the message says that China wants to have state relations with the Soviet Union on the basis of the five recognized principles, as well as on the basis of decisions that were taken in Pek'ing in the talks between the two prime ministers, Kosygin and Zhou Enlai. In other words China is responding positively to Brezhnev's advances for improvement of their relations. We shall see later what direction this softening takes: Will it become steadily more pronounced or will it remain at this level? This is a three-handed game being played between the Americans, the Soviets and the Chinese. Since Deng Xiaoping declared that China needs 20 to 25 years peace in order to become a great "socialist" power, then tempers have to be cooled. China has to ease the tension with the Soviet Union, too, because the war will be waged with that country, and if this war breaks out more quickly, China cannot be built as Deng Xiaoping and Hua Guofeng intend. The prospect is that China will eventually climb into bed with the two of them, that is, both with the

Americans and with the Soviets. In these conditions we must be vigilant, must stand in strong Marxist-Leninist positions and expose the treacherous manoeuvres of all the revisionist currents circulating in the world against the revolution and the peoples national liberation struggle.

#### One of the Most Reactionary Slogans of The Chinese

Under this title appears the note of Wednesday, November 9, 1977, in which Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: The notorious slogan of the Communist Party of China which appeals to the United States of America and the reactionary capitalist countries of the world, that is, half of the "first world" and the whole of the "second world," as it calls them, to unite with all the peoples of other countries, which it lumps together in the "third world," is one of the most reactionary. In other words, the Communist Party of China is calling for predatory imperialist war. On this issue it is like the Second International which, in the year 1914-1916, launched the slogan of "Defence of the Fatherland" (bourgeois). In this way the revisionist party of China is deceiving the peoples and the proletariat with this reactionary slogan, putting them in the position of assisting world finance capital. The United States of America and the other imperialist states, Bonn, Germany, Japan, etc., have the desire and aim to rule the world, to exploit the peoples and oppress the proletariat.

It is clear to the genuine Marxist-Leninists that the proletariat must be absolutely opposed to such a war and that, in particular, it must make every effort to ensure that the government and the so-called Communist Party of China fail, suffer defeat, over this anti-Marxist political line which they are pursuing. The international proletariat must fight likewise, against the respective reactionary governments which are ruling in the capitalist and revisionist countries and must foil their plans for a war of plunder by impeding this preparation for imperialist war and, if it breaks out, turn it into a civil war to overthrow the ruling bourgeoisie of the country and to take power into its own hands.

#### China Has Pretention To Becoming the Dominant Power in the World

In the note of Sunday, November 27, 1977, Comrade Enver Hoxha exposes the expansionist and hegemonic aims of social-imperialist China, its ambitions to become a superpower. He writes:

Deng Yingchao, the widow of Zhou Enlai, went to Iran to pay a visit to the shah of that country and Princess Ashraf, the great "friends" of Mao Zedong's China. Princess Ashraf was welcomed with great pomp in China two or three times, by Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai.

Deng Yingchao's visit was preceded by a long article by the XINHUA News Agency and the newspaper RENMIN RIBAO, which spoke of the majesty of the



of the shahanshah, about "flourishing" Iran, about this "free" and "independent" country which allegedly fights sternly against the two superpowers. What a disgrace for China that it praises a bandit and a son of a bandit.

China, continues Comrade Enver Hoxha, has become a big state, servile to American imperialism in order to defend capitalism and all the reactionary bourgeoisie under whatever mask it presents itself; it support the shah of Iran, the policy of Washington, of Paris, of Bonn, of London, in a word. The policy of imperialists of every nature, every colour and every state. It disguises all this with a fig-leaf, allegedly with the struggle against Soviet social-imperialism, but the struggle against Soviet social-imperialism on the part of China has only the character of territorial expansion. The aims of China are to occupy the territories to the north, such as Siberia, Mongolia, etc. It also has its eye on the whole of India and the other countries of Southern Asia, like Indonesia, the Philippines, the Far East, Australia, etc., if not to take control of them, at least to extend its influence over them.

Mao Zedong wanted to restore China to its ancient majesty of centuries ago. In other words, in the modern age, China was to become the "middle kingdom" as it was called in the ancient times of Confucius and the emperors. Mao Zedong, Liu Shaoqi and Zhou Enlai did not fight for the triumph of socialism and communism. They have worked to avoid proletarian revolutions in Asia and now throughout the world.

China, stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha, has pretensions to becoming the dominant power in the world. It dreams of overtaking not only the Soviet Union, but also the United States of America, but its loins, as they say in Gjirrokastër, hence its real strength, especially its economic and military strength, are insufficient for it to be able to realize the hegemonic policy which it dreams of and is hatching up. The policy of China is enslaving and the peoples are understanding this, the proletariat is understanding this, the bourgeoisie understands it, and progressive people understand it. In their desire for hegemony, in order to achieve the enslavement of the peoples, the Chinese leaders support the enslavement of the peoples by the imperialists whom China actually calls "friends," "well-wishers," indeed even "liberators of the peoples." But in reality this policy has suffered and will suffer fiasco, because there is no one of normal judgment who can fail to be concerned to some degree, even if only minimally, about the interests of his own people and who can fail to understand this reactionary policy which China is pursuing at present.

**Communists Are Being Killed in the World--  
The Chinese Revisionists Could not Care Less**

In the note of Friday, December 2, 1977, Comrade Enver Hoxha exposes the base stand the Chinese revisionists have adopted towards the hangmen of the Marxist-Leninists and the peoples. He writes.

The news agencies report that the chairman of the Communist Party of the Philippines, together with a group of other comrades of the Central Committee of the party, has been arrested by the dictator Marcos.

On the other hand, the Philippine dictator is wreaking havoc against the Marxist-Leninists of the Philippines, who are fighting for the freedom, independence and sovereignty of the islands against the foreign yoke and the internal yoke of capital. But the Chinese revisionists couldn't care less. The Chinese couldn't care less about the other parties of the Far East either, towards which they have acted in the same way.

This is a crime committed by the Maoist leadership against the Marxist-Leninists of Asia. Now it is carrying out the same activity all over the world, in Europe, in Latin America, Africa, Australia, and everywhere else.

Under the disguise of Marxism-Leninism it aims to lead these countries and these parties on the capitalist road, while China becomes dominant over them in order to counter-balance the two superpowers and become a superpower itself.

#### Gloomy Chinese Panorama

This is the title of the note of Thursday, December 8, 1977. Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: The Chinese panorama is gloomy, both inside and outside China.

We see that the China of Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping has discredited itself, in the full meaning of the term, in the international arena. Its voice is hardly heard in the world. It does not speak out on any capital problem which is concerning mankind, which is concerning the peoples and states. It has only one slogan: The unity of all states of the world, of the "second world" and the "third world," as it calls them with American imperialism against Soviet social-imperialism. This is the pivot of the Chinese foreign policy.

This, then, is the aim that dominates the foreign policy of China. China calls on the world proletariat, the oppressed peoples, the colonial and semi-colonial peoples, etc., to unite with American imperialism, to unite with the reactionary bourgeoisie of their own countries, allegedly to fight against Soviet social-imperialism. China does not put forward any other problem and is not able to do so. Why is it not able? Because it has included itself in the "third world." Generally speaking, however, the countries of this "third world" are linked either with American imperialism or with Soviet social-imperialism. China itself, a member of the so-called third world, is linked with American imperialism and its satellites, hence with the cliques of the countries of the "third world."

In these conditions China cannot have one thought, cannot raise or defend one question in the interests of a state of the "third world" or groupings of several states of the "third world" which might be in revolt against

American imperialism, but it supports those capitalist leaderships, which, because of the circumstances of the moment present themselves as opposed to Soviet social-imperialism. In this way, apart from being colourless, without substance, lacking fire, for the reason that they are not revolutionary, all the international stands of China make it quite obvious that China supports the American imperialist enslavement of the peoples. Thus the peoples, whom it calls of the "third world" and of whom it intends to become the shepherd, do not listen to this cheating shepherd who sings in harmony with that imperialism that oppresses them. The peoples of the so-called third world draw the conclusion that the Chinese policy is bad, an anti-popular policy, a false policy, just as its stand against Soviet imperialism is false.

Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha continues: China has become enmeshed in the machinery of taking credits from the multinational companies, various capitalist states and American imperialism. This is China's whole policy. China is trying to take its place amongst the states of the so-called third world, but it is trying to take this place with nothing in its head and nothing in its pocket, merely because it applauds one imperialism and, in words, attacks another imperialism. This, then, is all it is doing, because from the economic aspect, it has no possibility to provide aid for other states and indeed now it is not even fulfilling the official and moral obligations which it has towards other states under contracts which were signed at the time when China posed as a socialist country. Now the Chinese leaders have thrown off their disguise, and therefore they can dishonour these agreements which they have signed. It can be seen clearly that the Chinese revisionists are in no way different from the Soviet revisionists in their stands and actions towards us and towards the world—they are just as much revisionist, just as much social-imperialist. The only difference being that they are new social-imperialists who have to create that colonial strength at which they aim. But when they will create it and how they will create it, that is another matter. In their relations with the outside world, the Chinese are trying in vain to peddle their rotten anti-Marxist revisionist ideology as Marxist-Leninist ideology. But there is not one in the world so silly as to eat soap for cheese. Everybody, whether genuine Marxist-Leninists, democratic elements, or reactionaries, understands very well that the Chinese ideology is not in any way Marxist-Leninist.

The Chinese revisionists have rejected Marxism-Leninism and have adopted a new form of revisionism wrapped up with a markedly social-democratic capitalist ideology and mixed with the old reactionary Chinese feudal, statist philosophy. They are trying to spread this policy, this ideology, but it is not establishing itself anywhere. China has entered into a number of negotiations dangerous to mankind and to itself. It is fighting for hegemony, and to this end, sacrificing the interests of its own people and other peoples. Everything it says, allegedly about the interests of the peoples, is demagoguery, a tasteless and badly disguised bluff.

### China Has Neo-Colonialist Aims

In the note of Friday, December 9, 1977, Comrade Enver Hoxha exposing the neo-colonialist aims of China, writes: It is a fact that with its theory of the "third world" China is now making great efforts to turn into a super-power, a neo-colonialist great power.

The Chinese leaders have set out on the course of the maximum exploitation of the large and industrious population of their country in order to create a force by means of which China can spread throughout the world to seek and capture new markets, to exploit the wealth of other countries and peoples in order to become a superpower. But at present, revisionist China is unable to engage in a struggle on the two flanks, with the two superpowers, in order to achieve this objective, therefore it is relying on world capitalism, which is represented by American imperialism and the other wealthy capitalist states, against Soviet social-imperialism.

Such an ambition existed in China a long time ago. I recall that somewhere in the pages of my diary I have dealt with this problem, saying that at one moment the Chinese leadership was in euphoria and had pretensions about the struggle on the two flanks--both against American imperialism and Soviet imperialism, and precisely at those moments when Indonesia withdrew from the United Nations, Zhou Enlai, in the name of Mao Zedong's China, launched the slogan that China, together with Indonesia and a series of other Asian states, should create a new organization of United Nations, in opposition to the United Nations organization which was founded after the Second World War. This was allegedly as a consequence of the Maoist strategy in the struggle against the two superpowers which were making the law in the United Nations, but the aim of this step was that the states of Asia mainly, as well as those of Africa, should gather round China and together, undertake a political, ideological and military struggle against American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

Hence, as early as at that time, the Maoists were striving to create a grouping round great China, so that it would become the leadership of a series of states of the "third world."

The idea which Zhou Enlai expressed publicly at that time about the creation of a new, break-away organization of United Nations in opposition to the existing one, now, at these moments, assumes its true meaning of the political and ideological ambition of the Maoists and makes obvious how these pseudo-Marxist elements tried and are still trying to exploit the current developments in the interests of their capitalist line of domination, hence, it makes obvious their old tendencies to make China a neo-colonialist super-power.



[AU071310 0900 GMT 7 Nov 79 AU]

["'Reflections on China'--Extracts From the Political Diary by Comrade Enver Hoxha Leafing the Pages of the Second Volume"--ATA headline; Part Twelve. See JPRS 73890 of 24 July 1979, No 1701 and JPRS 74000 of 13 Aug 79 No 1707 of the EAST EUROPE REPORT on Extracts From Volume I.]

[Text] Tirana, November 7, ATA--Following the numerous zig-zags of the Chinese foreign policy, Comrade Enver Hoxha analyses in his notes its various stages. Apart from the analysis in the strategic plane, he dwells on and analyses this policy also in its tactical plane. In the tactical plane, Comrade Enver Hoxha speaks of the three stages of the Chinese foreign policy. The note of Sunday, December 18, 1977 speaks precisely of these three stages. It is entitled:

#### The Incoherence of China's Foreign Policy

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

Many ambassadors of capitalist countries of the so-called third world are astonished at the incoherence of the foreign policy of China in connection with the "three worlds." They cannot understand how it is possible that a big country, which poses as a socialist country, can pursue such a confused policy. And in fact the relations which China has with various countries and states show that its foreign policy is not the object of serious study, but on the contrary, in this direction thoughtlessness and naivety and, we can say, an incoherence to the point of stupidity is displayed.

As I have written in my notes in connection with China, the initial positions of China show that the Chinese leaders remained very isolated, did not make efforts to have contacts with the states of the world. This astonishing stand of a political self-isolation, as you might say, seemed the most correct course to the Chinese leaders. But in reality, why did this occur, what did this policy show? This unwise Chinese policy came first of all from the lack of stability in China, regardless of the fact that the impression was given that there was stability, it showed also that amongst the Chinese leadership, in the Communist Party of China, there was a series of opposing views flourishing, which did not permit a correct line to be determined in foreign policy. There were many different currents, one pulling in one direction, the other in another direction. Thus the foreign policy of China was always fluid and hesitant, though China gave the impression of a state which looked down on others from the summit of Olympus, or better say, from the highest peak of the Himalayas.

Later the Chinese came out of their shell and began to extend their contacts to some extent on some continents, establishing diplomatic relations with a number of states. However these diplomatic relations of China had a

regional character, an Asiatic character, opposed to Europe, opposed to the states of Latin America and other capitalist states. If the aims of the Chinese foreign policy at that period are analysed, it will be seen that China passed from the phase of isolation to a phase of a special system of diplomatic relations in order to create an Asiatic grouping with bourgeois capitalist states which might possibly accept, so to say, the hegemony of China.

In order to avoid establishing diplomatic relations with different countries of the world, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, China made the question of Taiwan an obstacle. This, you might say, was the touchstone of China's relations with the foreign world. However the capitalist world studied the situation and understood China's aims. On the one hand it was interested in establishing diplomatic relations with China because it is a big market for the capitalist world, of which it was in need, but on the other hand, it could not sacrifice Taiwan.

Thus, for a very long time China continued its policy of self-isolation and the establishment of some relations of a regional, Asiatic character. Then there came a new moment when the Chinese leaders thought they could no longer proceed in this way and must find a formula to remove the stumbling-block of Taiwan from the middle of the road where they had placed it. They found this formula, applied it and began to establish diplomatic relations with many states. These relations, naturally, still did not bring the admission of China to the United Nations organization, despite our efforts and the struggle we waged within this organization, together with the other friends of China who wished it well.

Despite our efforts, the admission of China to the UN was "sternly" opposed by the United States of America and all those states which had major interests with it and could not come out against it.

But the other moment came in the Chinese foreign policy: The Chinese changed their strategy, from the strategy of the struggle against American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism they went over to the strategy of alliance with the United States of America against the Soviet Union. Then the thaw began with the United States of America, too, and at long last, China was admitted to the United Nations organization.

The position which China adopted after its admission to the UN, a position which it had prepared for 12 or 15 years on end through countless talks with the American ambassador in Warsaw, led to the triumph of this new strategy of Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai in the secret talks between the two ambassadors in Warsaw and later, between Kissinger on one side, and Mao and Zhou Enlai on the other. China set out on the course of friendship with all the capitalist countries of the world and stepped up the struggle against Soviet social-imperialism. China built up a crazy anti-Marxist, reactionary strategy of reaching accord and agreement with American imperialism and with all the other bourgeois capitalist states of the world in order to create a common front against Soviet social-imperialism in this way.

The policy of China in its relations with the other countries developed into the China-United States of America axis. Taiwan was forgotten. Hong Kong and Macao were forgotten, and even Vietnam, which was fighting, was forgotten. And precisely at the time when Vietnam was being savagely bombed the final talks between Mao and Zhou Enlai on the one hand, and Kissinger and Nixon on the other, took place.

Precisely at this time the United States of America gave the green light and friends of the Americans began one after the other to establish diplomatic relations with the "socialist" China of Mao Zedong.

Concretely, China set out on the anti-socialist course and this determined its ideology, strategy and tactics even more clearly: friendship and alliance with the United States of America, from which China is to benefit in technology, in the economy and armament, China is also for friendship and alliance with all the other developed capitalist countries from which it will get credits for new technology and armaments. In regard to other countries from which it could not get either credits or technology, China was to exert its influence on them through its allegedly socialist policy as their benefactor and defender and thus gradually, on this axis of Sino-American friendship, create a terrain for the growth of its own hegemony in the future. From this strategy Mao Zedong came out with a "brilliant analysis" of the division of the world into "three worlds."

Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha further one, have declared officially that the Cultural Revolution in China is over. That is, they took power and decided that there would be no more proletarian or proletarian cultural revolution there. On the international platform, that is, in foreign policy, this clique continues to keep the slogan of "three worlds" in force. However, the "three worlds" do not have unity, either within each country or with one another. Herein lies the aberration of this absurd theory, by means of which China is seeking to establish its hegemony and become a world superpower. Since unity does not exist amongst the states which form these "three different worlds," this means that permanent diversity and duality exists within them because of the major contradictions among them. The law of the jungle reigns in these states. "A hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools contend" precisely in these so-called three worlds, therefore it is not so easy for the China of Hua Guofeng to bring about the unification of these "three worlds," and establish its power over them, as it is doing internally, where it is establishing the bourgeois dictatorship.

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes further on:

To advocate unity with half of the "first world," or unity in the "second world" or the "third world," under the leadership of the Chinese, and their slogan that allegedly all these "worlds" are in danger from Soviet social-imperialism, means to have a short-sighted view and to fail to take account of the international situation, the contradictions which are eroding capitalism, and the phase of the decay of imperialism and proletarian revolutions.

This reactionary, short-sighted policy has placed China in an impasse. Therefore, the Chinese foreign policy will be always wobbly, and even worse, this wobbling will be characterized by continuous grave defeats, because the policy of each of these "three worlds," which China will try to manoeuvre according to its "very clever" view, will have a tendency not towards unification but towards domination and splits. This is contrary to the aims of China, which will try to muster "the sheep" under its own crook, but these "sheep" are not sheep but wolves, and wolf knows wolf. Beasts live in the forest, and the forest is a jungle.

The Chinese foreign policy of "three worlds," or uniting all countries in a single bloc against Soviet social-imperialism, underlines Comrade Enver Hoxha, has not only run into obstacles, but has also suffered defeats. These defeats will occur one after the other, as the changing situations develop between states of different "worlds," as the Chinese call them, because of the great contradictions that exist between them, situation in which China does not know which side to take. What is ~~seen~~ today is not vindicated by time tomorrow, and it switches to the opposite of what it thought and proclaimed earlier. In these situations China is incapable of maintaining any sort of equilibrium in its foreign policy. It is incapable of maintaining any equilibrium, not only like the United States of America and the Soviet Union, with which China secretly hopes to compete to establish its own domination in the world, but also like the other capitalist countries, which have greater experience in foreign policy and know how to manoeuvre, to form and dissolve alliances, to intervene with arms, subversion, and in a thousand other ways.

At present we see that in the face of these defeats of China's policy in the international arena, the Chinese revisionist leadership headed by Hua Guofeng is not making its influence felt, is saying nothing, is not adopting stands towards the important events which are occurring in the world. Why is it not adopting stands? Because it sees that every step it takes is another defeat. Therefore, it remains silent, or whispers some stray idea which does not fool anybody, distinguishes itself, as you might say, only for its anti-Sovietism, and nothing else. But even its anti-Sovietism has been toned down to some extent, because, with its extremely wobbly policy, it cannot carry the struggle against Soviet social-imperialism through to the end and wants to leave the door open in order to manoeuvre more easily if it fails in the alliance it has with American imperialism. This is natural. If China continues to follow such an anti-Marxist, capitalist, pragmatic policy, it must also become a political juggler, otherwise there is no way it can remain on this course, because the others won't allow it to exist. It could exist, it could triumph, could hold its head high, only if it defended socialism, only if it were guided by the Marxist-Leninist theory, but this option is no longer open to it. China has ended up in the mire, and its anti-Marxist policy will sink it even more deeply in the filth. Only a genuine proletarian revolution can save China from this abyss, from this tragedy.



### American Comments on China

In the note of Tuesday, December 20, 1977, Comrade Enver Hoxha once again points out that China, when it will deem it necessary, will make approaches also to the Soviet Union.

In this note he writes:

The radio called "The Voice of America" has now begun to speak openly about the friendship which links the United States of America with the China of Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping.

In one of its broadcasts, "The Voice of America" gave an interview by Senator Mansfield who is the present ambassador of the United States to Japan. Mansfield declared that the present stand of the Peoples Republic of China is encouraging for the Western world.

Mansfield declared that Deng Xiaoping is the heir of Zhou Enlai and executor of his will. He says confidently that Deng will faithfully carry out Zhou's ideas for the modernization of China by the year 2000.

Mansfield is certain that China will not make approaches to the Soviet Union, because it has taken a course of resolute opposition to it. This American expert rejects the rumours which speak about approaches between the Chinese and the Soviets and concludes that, at present, the state of American relations with China is good, but he draws attention to the "need for vigilance later, against the possibility of a rapprochement between China and the Soviet Union."

It emerges from this statement by this notable American personality, who has not gone as ambassador of the United States of America to Japan without a purpose, that Deng Xiaoping is the most reliable personality for the preparation and strengthening of the Sino-American alliance. We were convinced of this, but likewise convinced that Deng Xiaoping is an adventurer who, if he and his group can seize power completely, if they are able to completely liquidate the influence of the opponents, who are also adventurers, could further accelerate the rapprochement of China with the United States of America, might preserve the status quo for a certain time, but when he sees it necessary, might also make approaches to the Soviet Union, too. This, of course, will occur when China has become deeply involved in economic, political and military relations with the United States of America and the other developed capitalist countries, or when it sees that these states are not giving China what it seeks. Then China will seek a second string to its bow, that is, it will also seek rapprochement with the Soviet Union.

China's Policy Must Be Combated Mercilessly  
Because It Is Causing Great Damage to the  
World Revolution

Chinese social-imperialism is as dangerous as American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. It must be exposed with the same force as the other two imperialist superpowers. In the note of Saturday, December 24, 1977, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes among others:

It is natural that all the communists throughout the world, all progressive people, the peoples who are fighting for political and economic freedom, etc., are very worried about the pro-imperialist policy of China. It is unprecedented and unheard of in the modern history of peoples and states that such a big country should so openly pursue a scandalous policy to achieve an unprincipled unity with a powerful imperialist state such as the United States of America.

The present stand of China becomes even uglier and more hypocritical when that country continues to pose and advertise itself as a socialist country, a country which allegedly fights for the revolution, for the destruction of world capitalism and imperialism to their foundations. This is one of the most reactionary courses that the international communist movement and the world progressive movement could possibly see. Neither the peoples nor the progressive states with their own political dignity, their own views, whatever they may be, with which they defend themselves and fight to avoid becoming serfs of a big country or state, can accept such a policy.

Pseudo-socialist China is submitting to the conditions of American imperialism, with the policy it is pursuing, with its strategy and tactics, it has placed itself against the revolution and the peoples national liberation struggle. China will not support the peoples national liberation struggle with material aid, or even with political backing. This is a stand of submission to the main objective of American imperialism.

China has undertaken to propagate the American policy as a "peaceful" policy, to present the United States of America as non-aggressive, a state which allegedly desires the status quo and provides aid for the development of mankind. China is acting in this way to justify the "aid" which it is now taking itself from the United States of America. Hence, with its stand, China is urging that the United States of America should invest, undisturbed, in other countries of the world, too.

China has undertaken (and this is the ardent desire of the American imperialists) to attack Soviet social-imperialism every day, that is, to weaken the main competitor of American imperialism, which is, at the same time, also its own main competitor as a superpower. China is not waging this struggle against the Soviet Union from the Marxist-Leninist standpoint, but from the capitalist positions of a big state which aspires to become an imperialist superpower and proceeding from its old ambitions over territorial questions.

Therefore, the "theory" of the Chinese that they are attacking the Soviet Union allegedly because it is an ideological enemy is groundless.

Another question that shows that revisionist China has placed itself in the service of American imperialism is the attempt which it is making to rally all the states of the world around the United States of America. That is, it is trying to place the states which have contradictions with American imperialism under the latter's direction. China "advises" these states that they should "eliminate" the contradictions they have with American imperialism. China is making the greatest efforts in this direction, going so far as to call on the world proletariat and the Marxist-Leninist communist parties to unite with the bourgeoisie of their own countries in a great political, ideological and military bloc, with the United States of America, with world capitalism, against Soviet social-imperialism. This, likewise, is total political and ideological submission to American imperialism.

The other mission of importance which the Chinese policy has undertaken to carry out is that of splitting the Marxist-Leninist communist parties of the world, which have emerged from the ranks of the proletariat and are fighting to organize it in the revolution. Being resolutely opposed to the world revolution, proletarian revolutions, and the Leninist theses, China has set itself with all its might against the Marxist-Leninist communist parties, which it is splitting and liquidating.

There is no need for long explanations about the revisionist line of China in all these directions which I have mentioned, because it is obvious. The policy of China must be combated mercilessly, must be exposed, because it is causing great damage to the world revolution, the peoples and socialism and is an opportunist policy which brings grist to the mill of imperialism and revisionism. This is criminal and the criminals, be they political ones, must be unmasked and knocked on the head.

The present reactionary Chinese policy is greatly disturbing the peoples, therefore the aims of this policy must be made clear to them. The peoples understand the danger which the present Chinese policy brings and also understand the correct aims and the revolutionary road of the Party of Labour of Albania and the Peoples Socialist Republic of Albania. It is precisely by acquainting themselves with our correct stands that the peoples, the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties, as well as many states with differing political opinions, but which do not want to be subjected to American imperialism or any other enslaving imperialism support the policy of our party and state.

We have pointed out previously how Khrushchevite revisionism took up the policy of rapprochement with American imperialism and we stressed the combination of the Khrushchevite policy with the policy of reaction. There is no reason why all we communists of the world should be surprised when we see the same thing developing now between China and the United States of America, that is, a combination of their internal and world interests.

The two sides are linked together through these interests, therefore, they make concessions to each other, of course, at the expense of other peoples. On the one hand, American imperialism wants to preserve its own hegemonic power, and moreover is trying to increase this power at the expense of its rival social-imperialist power, while on the other hand, China is trying to create its own empire, that is, to establish its own influence in the world. Hence, since the interests of these two big states, the one an affirmed imperialist power, and the other trying in various ways to affirm itself as such, are combined with one another, these interests cannot but be in opposition to the general interests of world peace, the interests of the peoples national liberation struggles and the interests of the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

CSO: 2020

END



**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

3 Dec. 79

DD.